Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/coenadomini0000john

Chas D Chapman

CŒNA DOMINI.

CŒNA DOMINI

AN ESSAY ON

THE LORD'S SUPPER

Its Primitive Institution and Apostolic Uses

BY THE

REV. JOHN MACNAUGHT, M.A.,

EX-INCUMBENT OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S, LIVERPOOL; OF LAURA CHAPEL, BATH; AND OF TRINITY CHAPEL, CONDUIT STREET, LONDON.

NEW YORK

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF EVANGELICAL KNOWLEDGE.

1881

BV
825
.M23
1881

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, ... ix–xv

§ 1. The Central Act of Christian Life and Worship, ... ix

§ 2. The Use of this and other Books in Preparation for the Lord's Supper, xii

BOOK I.

THE INSTITUTION AND APOSTOLIC USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CHAPTER I.

THE INSTITUTION, ... 1–61

§ 1. Investigation of the Subject especially needed at present, . . 1

§ 2. The Terms "Objective," "Subjective," and "Real," . . . 2

§ 3. Neglect of the Question, What says Scripture? 3

§ 4. Metaphors connected with the Question, ... 4

§ 5. Old Testament Usage, ... 4

§ 6. New Testament Usage, ... 5

§ 7. John vi, 26–63, as bearing on our Investigation, ... 6

§ 8. Narratives of the Institution, ... 17

A. St. John's Silence, and the Light thrown by him on our Subject, . 17

B. St. John and the Synoptists on the Date of the Last Supper, . 19

C. The Place of Institution, ... 22

D. The Paschal Supper, ... 24

E. Simple Introduction of the Subject by the Synoptists, . . 25

F. (*a.*) Parallel Histories by St. Paul and the Synoptists, referring to the Bread, ... 26

(*b.*) Comments on these Histories, ... 27

(i.) "Blessing," or "Giving of Thanks," 27

(ii.) The Words, "Take, eat," 28

(iii.) The Body "given," etc., ... 28

(iv.) "This do for My Remembrance," 29

(v.) Omissions instructive, ... 29

G. (*a.*) Parallel Histories of St. Paul and the Synoptists, referring to the Wine, ... 30

(*b.*) Comments on these Histories, ... 30

(i.) Epithet "New" before "Covenant," 30

(ii.) The Blood-shedding once for all, ... 30

(iii.) The Wine "after" the Supper, ... 32

(iv.) "Drink of it, all of you," 32

PAGE.

(v.) Catholicity of Redemption, ... 33
(vi.) Frequency of Celebration, ... 34
(vii.) Error of "Fasting Communion," etc., ... 37
(viii.) The "New" Fruit of the Vine, ... 38
(ix.) St. Luke's Notice of Wine given before the Bread, . 41
(x.) Christ's Participation in the "New" Fruit of the Vine, . 42
H. (*a.*) Christ's Words in Administering the Bread and Wine, . . 44
(*b.*) Comments on the Administration, ... 45
(i.) From briefest Forms, what follows? 45
(ii.) Four Records of the Administration, ... 47
(iii.) Phrase "For Remission of Sins," 48
(iv.) Variations in the Records, ... 48
(v.) Habit of Abbreviating the Words of Christ's Administration, ... 49
(vi.) St. Luke and St. Paul on the Administering of the Wine, 49
(vii.) The Records differing, which is our better Guide? . 50
(viii.) Failing an Answer, what follows? 51
(ix.) The Cup a "Covenant," 52
(x.) The Simpler Form of Administering the Wine, . . 53
(xi.) From this is to be inferred the Form, or Meaning, in Administering the Bread, ... 58
(xii.) Remembrance, not Sight, aimed at, ... 59
(xiii.) Test the Hypothesis of Objective Change, . . . 60
(xiv.) Conclusion, ... 61

CHAPTER II.

THE APOSTOLIC USES OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, ... 62-146
§ 1. The Days between Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, . . 62
§ 2. (*a.*) The Journey to Emmaus and the Meal there, ... 63
(*b.*) An "Objective" Presence at Emmaus, and its Bearing on our Inquiry, ... 69
§ 3. (*a.*) "Breaking Bread" at Jerusalem, ... 71
(*b.*) An Appeal to "Antiquity," 81
(*c.*) The "Gladness," etc., of the Early Christian "Breaking of Bread," 82
§ 4. St. Paul on the Lord's Supper, ... 86
(*a.*) 1 Cor. x, 16, 17, etc., ... 87
(*b.*) 1 Cor. xi, 17–34, ... 97
§ 5. St. Paul and the "Breaking of Bread" at Troas, ... 114
§ 6. Scripture Promises of Christ's Presence, not more in the Lord's Supper than on other Occasions, ... 119
(*a.*) Matt. xviii, 19, 20, ... 121
(*b.*) John xiv, 23, ... 122
(*c.*) 1 Cor. xiv, 23, ... 126
(*d.*) Gal. i, 16, etc., ... 127
(*e.*) Matt. xxviii, 16–20, ... 128
(*f.*) Rev. iii, 14–22, ... 129
§ 7. Other Scriptures connected with our Subject, ... 134
(*a.*) Acts xxvii, 25, ... 135
(*b.*) 1 Cor. xiv, 16, etc., ... 136

PAGE.
§ 8. Scripture Light on the Attempt to set the Lord's Supper above all other Acts of Christian Life or Worship, ... 139
§ 9. The Lord's Prayer and the Lord's Supper in respect of their Direct and Unaltered Descent to us from Christ, ... 142
§ 10. Scripture Usage as to "the Body of Christ," 143
§ 11. Conclusion, ... 145

BOOK II.

POST-APOSTOLIC USES OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CHAPTER I.

PLINY'S MENTION OF THE CHRISTIAN "SACRAMENT," . . . 147-159

CHAPTER II.

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN WRITINGS WITH REFERENCE TO THE LORD'S SUPPER, 160-259
A. Justin Martyr's Testimony, ... 164
(*a.*) From the Dialogue with Trypho, ... 164
(*b.*) From the Apology, ... 165
(*c.*) Comments on these Passages, ... 168
B. Principles laid down by Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Augustine—the last as quoted by Gratian, ... 174
C. Further Comments on Justin, ... 175
(*a.*) His adoption of "This is My Body" and "This is My Blood," . 179
(*b.*) His Reference to the "Mysteries" of the God Mithras, . . 182
D. Occasional Ambiguity the utmost Charge, with reference to materializing Christ's Presence, that can be brought against Justin and the Early Christian Writers, ... 192
E. Epochs in the History of Sacramental Materialism, . . . 194
1. Justin (and Ignatius?) 194
2. Cyprian, ... 195
3. Four Unscriptural Accretions on the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 196
4. Working of these Accretions, ... 197
5. Circumstances particularly favorable to these Accretions, . . 198
6. Prevailing Opinion in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, . . 201
7. The Neglected Question, Is Credulity a Sign of Reverence? . 202
8. Councils (Fourth Lateran and Tridentine), ... 203
F. Protests and Opposition on the part of more Spiritual Believers, . 204
G. The Lord's Supper gradually converted into "The Mass," . . 206
H. Opposing and Spiritual Principles laid down by the Greatest of the Fathers, ... 209
I. Translation of the Salisbury Mass-Book, ... 219
J. Comments on this Mass-Book, ... 232
1. Change of Name, ... 232
2. Language of Worship, Intelligible or Unintelligible, . . . 234
3. The terms "Priest," "Altar," "Sacrifice," 235
4. "Vestments," etc., ... 236
5. The Idea of "Merit," 237

PAGE.

6. "Ave Maria," etc., ... 238
7. Confession, in the Mass, ... 240
8. Absolution, in the Mass, ... 241
9. "Holy of Holies," etc., ... 242
10. The Sign of the Cross, ... 244
11. "Corporalia," 244
12. The "Pax," 244
13. Bringing in the Elements, ... 245
14. "In the Name of the Father," etc., ... 245
15. Inconsistencies in the Mass, ... 246
16. Words of Institution in the Mass, ... 249
17. Sacrifice for the Dead, ... 253
18. The "Amen," 254
19. The "Sermon," 254
20. Participation or Communion, ... 255
21. Utter Change in the Mass, ... 257

K. The Plan of this Essay excludes an Historical Analysis, in detail, of Extant Ancient Liturgies, ... 257

L. Conclusion—the Contrast, ... 258

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *The Central Act of Christian Life and Worship.* WHAT is the central and highest act of Christian life and worship? We unhesitatingly reply, Such an act can only consist in the soul's inmost union with God and Christ, in its devotion to Him who, on the cross of old, and in heaven now and always, devotes Himself to procure for us His Spirit and all good things in accordance with the beneficent will of the Father.

The central and highest act of Christian life and worship must thus have its root in God and Christ; but as there is no selfishness in God, whose center has been described as everywhere and His circumference nowhere, or in Christ, who pleased not Himself, but gave His entire life a sacrifice of obedience and love for the redemption of the world from sin and self, so, when a man enters into union with this God in Christ, though the first vow may be registered in the depths of affection and thought, where holiest resolves are formed, yet from this unselfish and world-redeeming religion the early and continuous outcome must be love and sympathy and help and blessing for every child of man on whose behalf Christ once died and now lives for ever.

Union with God in Christ implies communion and co-operation with every man,—with the king who is to be honored, with the lowliest who is to be reverenced,—as

having in him, despite the wounds and scars of sin, such a mind as can study and discover, or else can comprehend, the works of God in nature and in grace; or, better still, as having such a heart and spirit as can sympathize with the sorrowful like God, love the generous and the good even in its embryonic imperfection like Christ, or yield an admiring approval to suffering heroism as did the voice of Him who was well pleased with the crucified One.

Union with God in Christ, though its root may be hidden in the secret place of strongest resolutions, yet must show itself in love and beneficence towards all men, specially towards brothers in Christ, and more specially still towards the nearest and dearest in one's own house.

Thus the central and highest act of Christian life and worship must be devotion, however secret, to God and Christ, and devotion, open, active, unmistakable, to the dear ones of home first, then to those with whom we are at one in the love of Christ, then to those whose wants and weaknesses are like our own, while their minds and hearts are grand with all the stamp of the divine upon humanity, and interesting with all the infinite capacities to become like Newton or like Paul, like one of the spirits of the just made perfect, even like Christ.

Clearly, such union with God in Christ, such helpful fellowship with man for Christ's sake, may be originated in the sacrament of baptism, or may be sustained by the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; but it would be hard to say it could not have its origin in the joy and thankfulness of the bridegroom, in the broken heart of the disappointed and bereaved, in the mind and affections of man under any of the countless appeals of Him who, by His Spirit, ever stands at the door of man's heart and seeks

for admission that, out of whatever may be the source and occasion, He may bring forth the sanctifying results of union with Himself as God and of fellowship with men as His beloved.

However, whenever, wherever, this divine union, this humane fellowship, be originated or enhanced, we hold it to be the central and highest act of Christian life and worship.

This, however, and not the occasion out of which it springs, is the highest act alike of conversion and of sanctification.

We cannot tie this central and highest act to any outward rite; neither can we divorce it from any. The lightning flash on the road to Damascus, the moral reaction from some hideous sin, the pious resolves of her who confirms of deliberate choice that wise step taken for her in her unconscious infancy, the breaking of bread in some unadorned tabernacle or in some gorgeous cathedral, the appeal of the preacher, the example of the Christian, the horror of some crime in others or in self —these and a thousand other occasions may be the ground and medium of the union and the fellowship, but its root is deeper down in the heart of man and in God's secret dealings with that heart; and its growth and manifestation are vaster, more constant, more catholic and world-embracing, than any or all of these the surroundings and occasions of its emergence.

If one may borrow an illustration from the structure of a suspension bridge, these occasions are but the ground through which the mighty chain passes ere it becomes visible to man. The union and source of strength for that chain are deep down in the solid rock; its great work is not in or on the surrounding soil, the decorative

forms, or the beautiful flowers; its work is far and wide over the hideous chasm which it bridges for the good of every man who needs a passage from earth to heaven, from the temporal to the eternal, from the human to the divine.

Still it will be urged, This central and highest act of Christian life and worship, what is it? And not a few, in the present day, are ready to reply that it is the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, neither more nor less; this and nothing else.

If they are right, it must be well to know the truth; but if they are wrong, no small misconception, no unimportant misdirection of energy, must come out of such an error.

This inquiry, this question of the day and of the Church, engages us in the following pages.

Connected with this inquiry are wellnigh countless issues. The true nature and aim of the Christian sacrament; the mode and comeliness of its celebration; the line of feeling, and thought, and belief to be cultivated therein; the results to be expected therefrom; with what results we ought to be disappointed at the Lord's Supper; with what we should be thankfully and humbly satisfied; —all these issues, and many besides, lie in the investigation; and they all impel us to a study of the matters dealt with in the following pages.

§ 2. *The Use of this and other Books in Preparation for the Lord's Supper.*

One word should be said with reference to this work as a manual to be used in preparation for the Lord's Supper; and this word is, we believe, only the echo of that which

has been said by Bishop Wilson and almost every writer who has been engaged in a similar line of thought.

Let the reader who, apart from the mere critical study of a very important investigation, wishes to prepare himself to be a guest at the Lord's Table, master the subject as well as he can before taking part in the sacred rite itself. Let him make up his mind whether he is to look for a vision of Christ there present to the senses, or for a sanctifying memory of Christ once in that upper chamber in Jerusalem, once on that dreadful cross, now, bodily, at God's right hand in heaven, and, spiritually, in the heart of every man on earth.

Let the reader intelligently and piously comprehend the Liturgy[1] of his Church, and have a distinct impression in his own mind of all its important thoughts and phrases—especially, let him be clear in his judgment as to whether he will understand the service generally, and its parts in detail, in accordance with the mediæval Mass and its sacrifice of the host or victim, its altar for that sacrifice, and its corresponding priest; or whether he will understand the entire service, in its general spirit and in its details of expression and act, in accordance with the precepts and intentions of the Reformed, Protestant religion as by law established in England, and as brought back, three hundred years ago, into closer harmony with the Church of Christ and the apostles, as represented in the pages of the New Testament.

Let the reader, and especially the communicant, clear up these points thoroughly in his own mind by the help of God. Let him familiarize himself with every important term of the Liturgy, with every pregnant phrase—

[1] It may well be to remind the unprofessional reader that "Liturgy" is the appropriated name for the Communion as distinguished from other Church services.

like those, for instance, that deal with self-examination, with "mysteries," with eating the flesh of Christ, with being one with Christ, and the like; and when he has thus reasonably and devoutly studied the service, fixed his principles, hallowed his convictions, ripened his anticipations, then let him lay aside every book of instruction, and let him give his whole heart and mind to the important act he is about to perform. The confession and prayers and thanksgivings and joy of the Liturgy will give ample scope for all the activity of the most brilliant imagination or the most loving heart.

At any human banquet, in memory of noble acts and more noble men who wrought the acts, how unseemly would it be if the guests were engaged with books, at the table or in the assembly, for the purpose of then studying the achievements they were met to celebrate, or for the purpose of directing their thoughts and feelings into certain well-worn channels of routine as to the meaning and interpretation of what the president should say to them.

No, if the Liturgy is fit for its work, it is the best and only book that should accompany the communicant to the Lord's Table; and all his thoughts and feelings—informed and cultivated to the utmost in the periods of preparation—should now, under the guidance of the Liturgy, be full of Christ,—the Christ of the Supper Table in Jerusalem, the same Christ once upon the cross, the same Christ now ever living to intercede for us "according to God;" the same Christ who is "in us" always, unless we fall short of His standard;[1] the same Christ of whose divine presence we become conscious in prayer, in praise, in breaking of bread, or on any occasion of spiritual awak-

[1] 2 Cor. xiii, 5.

ening,—with this Christ the mind and heart should be full throughout, alike when we deplore sin, when we triumph in faith, when we ask pardon, when we hear the promise and the prayer that insure its bestowal, when we take the bread and the wine, when we join in the hymn that glorifies our God and His Christ, and when the final blessing sends us home to show forth, in ordinary conduct, the Lord who is ever with us, the light of our life in the meanwhile, the hope of glory for the great hereafter.

With these preliminary remarks we proceed at once to those investigations which constitute the main topic of our essay.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BOOK I.

THE INSTITUTION AND APOSTOLIC USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CHAPTER I.

THE INSTITUTION.

§ 1. *Investigation of the Subject especially needed at present.*

In this first book an attempt will be made to examine what is taught in Holy Writ concerning the divine institution and apostolic practice of the Lord's Supper, and concerning the benefits to be derived therefrom.

At all times such an inquiry should be of deep interest to Christians, who know that the earliest and purest information, with reference to their religion, as it issued from its divine Founder, can only be obtained in the writings of the New Testament. But, in the present day, when clergymen of learning and position declare in the most public manner—for instance, in the famous correspondence of the *Times* in January, 1875—that, unless there be an *objective* presence of Christ in the consecrated elements of the Supper, there is no use whatever in receiving those elements, and all plea for the continuance of the sacrament has vanished, it is more than interesting, it is absolutely necessary, to refer to the origi-

nal records of our religion, as it came from the hands of the Saviour and His apostles, in order to ascertain what may be the truth on this momentous question.

§ 2. *The Terms "Objective," "Subjective," and "Real."*

It will be well now, at the outset, to try and explain, once for all, what is meant by the words "objective" and "subjective," in the above-named correspondence, in this our essay and in general discussions of the question. "Subjective" denotes something existing in the mind or heart of him who thinks. "Objective" denotes something which has an independent existence separate from his thoughts. An illustration may here assist us. At the Lord Mayor's banquet there is an objective presence of the Prime Minister and certain other guests, quite irrespective of what men think or feel about that presence. At the poor man's breakfast table there is no objective presence of the late Mr. Cobden: but if, at any time, the poor man gratefully remembers that it is to Cobden he is indebted for his cheap loaf, then, and so often as the man's mind and heart thus recall Cobden, there is a subjective presence of the great statesman. He is present to the mind and feelings of the poor man; he is subjectively present in the man's memory and affections. The sign or channel of association by which Cobden is recalled to the man's memory is the bread. But yet Cobden is not present in the bread. That would be an objective presence. But he is only present in the mind of the thoughtful man—that is, he is subjectively present. What is objectively present in the bread—for example, the baked particles of wheat and such-like materials—is received and eaten by the child at the table, who knows nothing of Cobden and his history. With that child there is no presence of Cobden.

The objective presence of anything is independent of man's consciousness.

The subjective presence of anything depends wholly on man's mind realizing it.

The line of distinction between a material or corporeal presence of anything and its objective presence is thus perceived as too fine for recognition by any but the subtlest of metaphysical fancies; and no less fanciful, if not fictitious, is the distinction between spiritual presence, or presence in memory and affection, and subjective presence.

To all intents and purposes, and in all plain and intelligible use of words, an objective presence is the same as a material, corporeal, substantial presence; whilst a subjective presence is equivalent in meaning to a spiritual and ideal presence, a presence in the mind or heart of its subject.

"Real" presence, it is worth remembering in this line of remark, is an ambiguous phrase. It sometimes denotes objective, material presence; and at other times it signifies true presence, though only to the mind of the subject, and not at all in the matter of the object.

It is well to try and obtain clear views on these and kindred questions of the day. Definitions may be useful at a time when the desirableness of the Lord's Supper as a perpetual memory of Christ's death and of its blessed effects is made to depend on an objective presence of the Saviour's body in the bread, as contrasted with a subjective presence of His Spirit in the heart of man.

§ 3. *Neglect of the Question, What Says Scripture?*

Definition and investigation are needful, at a time like the present, when it is debated, even in the columns of

the daily press, what Cyprian said in the African Church, what Gregory taught in his Sacramentary, what Aquinas wrote for the schools; but, meanwhile, there is a portentous ignorance of that which is prescribed in those sacred Scriptures which, for English Churchmen, at all events, are authoritatively described as containing "all things necessary to salvation; so that, whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." (Article VI.)

It is to these Scriptures that we propose to make our present appeal.

§ 4. *Metaphors connected with the Question.*

On approaching the subject, however, of the institution of the Lord's Supper, there are certain preliminary points which demand attention.

It can hardly have escaped the reader's observation that metaphors like those which speak of "food for the mind," not only of reading, marking, learning, but also of "*inwardly digesting*" truth, "devouring an author," "drinking in thoughts," "imbibing principles," being "satiated" with a style or a subject—metaphors like these abound in our English language, as they do in all tongues.

§ 5. *Old Testament Usage.*

Not otherwise is the usage of the Hebrew Scriptures. Isaiah refers not to material nourishment for men's bodies when he exclaims, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money

for that which is not bread, and your labor for that which satisfieth not?" It is here some food for the soul which is indicated by the prophet: and for that nourishment he not only describes men as thirsting, but the means of supplying their spiritual appetite are themselves portrayed under the figures of "bread," "milk," "water," and "wine," the chief and typical supports of strength and instruments of refreshment.

Perhaps the most striking employment of this common metaphor in the pages of the Old Testament is that in Proverbs ix. 5, where Wisdom is represented as having built her house, furnished her table, and sent forth her maidens to cry upon the highest places of the city, "Whoso is simple, let him turn in hither: as for him that wanteth understanding, she saith to him, Come, *eat of my bread, and drink of the wine* which I have mingled." Here it is obvious that to eat Wisdom's bread and drink her wine is to learn her lessons and act upon her principles. This is a forcible metaphor, to denote union and incorporation between wisdom and man; but still it is a metaphor, and, in this and similar passages, no reader presses it further.

No man, for instance, who reads another verse of the Book of Proverbs (iv. 18) will be in danger of believing in an objective change of elements, when he is told that evil men "eat the bread of wickedness and drink the wine of violence."

§ 6. *New Testament Usage.*

From this general usage of the metaphor in common language, and from its frequent employment in the Hebrew Scriptures, and especially from its remarkable adoption by Wisdom, personified in the Book of Proverbs, let

us proceed to notice some parallel expressions in the New Testament. We will not dwell upon the beatitude which declares, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled," though this is based upon the idea that righteousness is meat and drink to the soul of man, and that, if we would find satisfaction for the infinite cravings of our spiritual nature, we must so incorporate ourselves into right and right into us, as if it were our very meat and drink.

In a similar manner, our Lord, in the conversation with His disciples springing out of His instruction of the woman of Samaria, declares He has *meat to eat*, that they know not of; and that this *meat* consists in doing the will of Him that sent him and finishing His work. Here, again, observe the figure. To confront this poor woman with herself, to awaken conscience in her to the recognition of her life and its guilt, to show her God, the Spirit God, who seeks men to worship Him in spirit and in truth, to make known to her the Messiah of this God, His Anointed One, who unveils Him as the Father—this work, this absorbing, satisfying work, is meat and drink to Jesus Himself. It satisfies and strengthens His whole soul and spirit.

§ 7. *John* vi. 26–63, *as bearing on our Investigation.*

Evidently our Saviour was no stranger to this forcible mode of expression. He used it frequently and in many applications. Among the most remarkable instances of this figure's employment by Jesus is that in the conversation recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel; and to this notable passage of Scripture we must now give a somewhat close attention.

At the outset, let it be borne in mind that the occur-

rences here narrated by the Evangelist preceded the crucifixion and the Last Supper by twelve months, as appears from John vi. 4; and, moreover, what is described in this portion of the fourth Gospel took place, not at Jerusalem, but on the shores of the Lake of Gennesareth, and especially at Capernaum and in its synagogue. This appears irrefragable from verses 1, 17, 24, 25, 59, of John vi. and from the opening words of chapter vii. Whereas *Jerusalem* was the scene of our Lord's *Last* Supper, *Capernaum* was the place which witnessed the conversation we are about to examine; and the date of this conversation was prior, by some twelve months, to the closing days of suffering at Jerusalem.

St. John's sixth chapter opens with an account of the five thousand being fed with five barley loaves and two small fishes. This was a work which delighted the multitudes. It was just what they expected and desired from their Messiah. They were ready to take its beneficent achiever and make Him their king by force. Such a bestower of material boons they would watch for, seek, and follow, with all the zeal which characterizes the seed of Abraham. In spite of the Saviour's only performing such a deed when it was needful, when He knew that it was right, in spite of the Master's withdrawing Himself and seeking seclusion, the people, in their ecstacy, sought Him out and found Him.

The twenty-sixth verse shows us how little Jesus was misled by their delight and apparent devotion to Him. "Ye seek Me," are His words, "not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." It was not the thing signified—God and His continual working with them and for them, and His manifestation to them in the man Jesus; it was not this

which drew the stiff-necked multitude. No; they had eaten of the loaves, and they longed for more. The spiritual, the religious, the soul-touching was nothing to them. It was after the carnal, the material, the worldly that they hankered. Still there was a zeal in them; and though it was far from being perfectly informed, yet it brought them, for the time, to Jesus; and he was more than willing to try and lead them on and up towards the higher, the better, and the more abiding.

Accordingly, the Saviour's words to them are (ver. 27), "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for Him hath God the Father sealed." Food for eternal life through the Son of the Divine Father! And this attached to "working the works of God" (ver. 28)! Here were words not so acceptable to the crowd as more loaves and fishes would have been. But still they remembered His former feeding of them, and they did not despair. What "work of God," they asked, was required of them? "Believe on him whom God hath sent," was the reply (ver. 29). Believe, indeed! Have faith and trust; and, probably, as they might think, let faith work by love and kindness! This was a demand upon their minds and hearts. It even looked as if it would involve them in work and labor for God, and not for pelf; and this earnest self-abnegation, this devotion to humanity and to God, were the last things they wished, the furthest from their contemplation. Still they were Jews, and could not help persevering in pursuit of their own ends. The loaves were yet in their thoughts. Could they not bring back the miracle-worker to their views? Thou askest faith. Well, what sign showest Thou (verses 30, 31) as a warrant for

our believing Thee? Something akin to Moses' old gift of the manna. More "bread from Heaven" canst thou give us "to eat"?

Not Moses, but God, bestowed that gift, replies our Lord (ver. 32); "but My Father giveth you the true bread from Heaven. For the bread of God is He which cometh down from Heaven and giveth life unto the world." Then the better side of the Jewish character shows itself, even in this hungry multitude. They exhibit a susceptibility to be affected by sacred things. Jesus recalled to their minds "the bread of God"; assuredly, no strange idea, but one which the manna of the wilderness, and probably the "*lekhem*," or "shewbread," and other offerings to Jehovah (*vide* Exod. xxv. 30, and Lev. xxi. 6, 8, 17, etc.) had made familiar to their minds in connection with the religion of their fathers and with the Temple and its holy usages. Was He, thought they, about to give them "manna," or "shewbread," or some other "bread of God," and to endow it with a new potency, with some Messianic charm against death? Was this the meaning of what He had said about the "bread of God" and "eternal life"? "Lord," is their exclamation (ver. 34), "evermore give us this bread."

Then follow the momentous words of the Saviour's reply (verse 35—40): "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." Distinct is this utterance of Jesus. The bread of God, the bread of Heaven, manna in the wilderness, shewbread in the Temple, or any other kindred ideas which, in the God-ward instincts of your souls or from the sacred teachings of your religion, you have learnt and now experience—these are all foreshad-

owings only of Him that is to come. They are the shadows; the substance is He on whom you now look. I am the bread, the food, the meat and drink of life. Are you at a loss how you can eat Me, or how you can drink Me? Coming to Me, entering into My society and fellowship, learning of Me—this is eating Me; and recognizing My trustworthiness, knowing that you may safely confide all to Me, believing in Me so as to give up all and follow Me, having faith which worketh by love—this is drinking Me. I am the bread of life, the reality, and more than the reality, of all your best dreams about a bread of God. He that so cometh to Me, as disciple and follower, eateth Me, and shall never feel the disappointment that makes men crave for a better and a higher. He that so trusts and devotes himself to Me, alike for action and for suffering, drinks Me, and shall never find his hope make him ashamed, but shall be satisfied and shall never thirst or wish to exchange for something else the true and only wells of salvation, the waters of eternal life, which are in Me.

Before we pass from this verse, let us notice distinctly that, according to our Saviour's own definition, eating Christ denotes *coming to Him*, and drinking Christ denotes *believing on Him.*

After our Lord has shown the multitude that it is only by recognizing and feeling the tender love of God as their *Father*, who draws and urges them towards Jesus, whom He has sent and sealed as the Messiah; and that, for any and all who will thus yield themselves to the Fatherly drawing and influence, there shall be perfect security, no such thing as being lost, but a certainty of being raised up, even at the last day, and of receiving the gift of eternal life;—after this lofty train of thought had been

touched by the Master, we find a reaction of doubt swaying the minds of his audience (verses 41, 42): "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that He saith, I came down from heaven?"

In reply to this doubt, and the consequent murmuring of the audience, Jesus repeats His teaching as to the necessity of men feeling God to be their loving Father, if they would recognize His Son, the Messiah, in a gentle and true carpenter from Nazareth. The possibility of this recognition of the Father is enforced on the attention of the people by an appeal to their own prophets (Isa. liv. 13; Jer. xxxi. 34; Joel ii. 28, etc.), whose testimony was that a time was coming when all men should be taught to know God as their Father.

In ver. 47 this teaching is followed up by the emphatic assertion, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life." The metaphor is dropped for a moment, and that action and movement of the mind and affections, which is faith in Jesus, is said to put a man instantly into the present possession and growing enjoyment of the true and eternal life.

Then (verses 48–50), there is a repetition of the Lord's assurance, "I am the bread of life," and a contrast between the transient effects of the manna in the wilderness and the imperishable results produced by Christ as the bread from heaven. In this passage is introduced the truth that eating Christ, or coming to Christ, will abolish death. For the disciple of Jesus, the change from existence in this world to existence in the eternal shall be so lighted up with faith, and hope, and joy, that those who thus eat of this "living bread" shall never die, but live for ever.

Observe this modification of the metaphor. It is the *living* bread, the *living* Jesus, with whom we must be incorporated in order to obtain this deliverance from the fear of death. Manna and material bread, or any lifeless object, will not suffice. Types and figures they may be, and they are—signs of something signified; but the reality is Jesus, "*living* bread."

And here (ver. 51) the insufficiency of the figure, suggested by the Jewish desire for more loaves and fishes, is made apparent; and, accordingly, our Saviour proceeds to employ a new and even more striking metaphor. "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." However surprisingly these last pregnant words, "My flesh for the life of the world," may have failed to carry to the minds of those who heard them a distinct instruction concerning the Lord's redemptive suffering, we have here a momentary abandonment of "bread" as the figure representing Christ; and we are introduced to the remarkable ideas which the Saviour proceeds to associate with the phrase, "My flesh," and its equivalents. My flesh, He says, I am going to make a sacrifice for the world: and as the flesh of your Paschal lamb and other sacrifices is partaken of by you Jews, in order that you may become incorporated into the system of sacrifice, self-denial, and devotion before God, so in like manner must be your incorporation with Me, the perfect sacrifice, who give My flesh for the life of the world.

Over these words arose a great strife amongst the multitude (ver. 52, they "strove among themselves," literally, they "fought or battled with one another"). "How," they asked, "can this man give us His flesh to eat?" The earnestness, as well as doubt, implied by

this vigorous questioning among His hearers calls forth from the Saviour an emphatic and reiterated enforcement, by different figures, of the same truth He had been urging on them throughout His conversation, namely, their need of being incorporated and united with Him.

You ought, He implies, to have been familiar with the idea of eating the flesh of a sacrifice; but I am more to you than any of your sacrifices. Their blood, indeed, you shed and sprinkled, but you did not drink it. With Me, however, so entire must be your union, that it must not only be an eating of My flesh, but a drinking of My blood. "Verily, verily" (verses 53–55), "I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed." All other meat and drink are for a time only, and minister primarily to the lower and animal life of man. This eating My flesh and drinking My blood, this "coming to Me" and "believing on Me" (according to ver. 35), is food for the mind and the affections, and is for eternity.

Then (ver. 56) the metaphor is varied and explained: This eating My flesh and drinking My blood is an abiding of the disciple in Me, as in a shelter and home; it is an abiding of Me in him, making him a very temple and shrine for My indwelling. As I live through the Father, so (ver. 57) shall he who is thus united with Me, eating My flesh and drinking My blood, coming to Me and believing on Me, abiding in Me and I in him,—so shall he live the higher life of the soul and of eternity through this union with Me. And this (ver. 58) is what I meant and said, at the outset of this discourse, when I told you,

in contrast with the perishable manna after which you hungered, of the bread which came down from heaven and fed man with eternal life.

Thus ends this marvellous and beautiful address. Its text might well be, Man doth not live by bread alone. His spirit hath its hunger and its thirst. The bread, the flesh, the wine for those cravings of the eternal in man, am I. Whoso, then, hungereth and thirsteth after righteousness must come to Me, must believe in Me, must abide in Me, and I must abide in him: he must live engrafted into Me, as I live in very union with the Father. This, and this only, is bread, and flesh, and wine—in a word, food—for the soul.

To many of our Master's disciples this was a "hard saying." To help them in their difficulty; to aid them in solving their remaining doubts as to, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" the gracious Teacher tells them how He will *not* give them His flesh and blood, that so, being excluded from false ideas, they may be, as it were, constrained to ascertain and recognize the truth.

Do not think, He proceeds (ver. 62), that it is My *material body* which constitutes the "flesh and blood" you are to eat and drink; for that body shall pass away out of your sight into heaven. Reflect, what will be the form of this your doubting question, "if ye behold the Son of man ascend up where He was before." Get rid, He urges (ver. 63), of the idea that I referred to anything material, or corporeal, or objective, when, under the figures of bread and flesh and blood, I taught you of the intimate, abiding, and living union of believing and loving discipleship that must subsist between you and Me, in order to your entering into man's true and eternal

life. "It is the Spirit," not matter of any kind, "that giveth life. The flesh profiteth nothing."

Were it even possible for you to eat with the teeth the flesh of Me, your Lord and Teacher, it would injure and not advantage you. Could you even lacerate the flesh of the Son of man, and suck from His veins and arteries the stream of His life's blood, the practice would be abhorrent, the idea detestable. In very deed, "The flesh profiteth nothing." It is the *words*, which I speak unto you, which are spirit, and which quicken unto eternal life. Feed your souls with My words of truth, and love, and self-surrender. Devour these. Imbibe the principles embodied in them. Drink of My Spirit. So shall you eat of the bread from heaven; so shall you be incorporated into Me, through My words, spirit into spirit, with a union a thousand times more intimate and abiding than any that can be brought about by material and objective binding of flesh to flesh. This spiritual engrafting is that to which, by the figures of bread and flesh and blood, I tried to lift your minds and hearts from the flesh-pots and the manna after which ye hungered.

Such is a brief comment upon this wonderful discourse of our Saviour's, delivered, be it remembered, at Capernaum long prior to His closing visit to Jerusalem, twelve months before the events which then and there occurred. Of course, we know how apt is the human mind to mix up all the language and all the metaphor of this discourse with the Lord's Supper; but it is very desirable we should, at least occasionally, clear up our conceptions on this subject, and bear distinctly in mind that, long before the Saviour conjoined these metaphors with symbols, He used them as metaphors, insisting on their force and guarding against their misconception and abuse.

If, as some say, in spite of the apostles and other listeners at Capernaum having no idea of the Lord's Supper which was to be instituted in the future, in spite of such an idea being impossible for them at the time, yet Jesus spoke "proleptically" or prophetically, intending His words to have a double meaning, one figurative and significant at the time, the other non-significant at the time, but capable of becoming significant a year afterwards,—if this explanation be offered or adopted by any, we can only say it is opposed to all our convictions as to the simplicity of the Saviour, alike in words and in character.

But, for the argument's sake, let us concede the possible truth of this "proleptic" theory. And what will follow? Why, in this "proleptic" reference to the Lord's Supper, we shall have one of the most spiritual and anti-objective interpretations of that institution. It will protest to us against expecting any profit from the carnal and material elements of that holy rite. It will insist for us that only when we approach the God who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth, through His life-giving words, and not in the flesh or through the flesh, do we rightly or truly eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man. It will show us that the validity of our communion depends on no objective presence even of Christ in the flesh, but depends entirely on the state of our minds and hearts and lives, and on Christ's consequent spiritual presence with us. Are we coming to Christ and believing on Him? Are we feeling and acting as He felt and acted? Is this our mental attitude, our lifelong habit? Then we are satisfying the hunger of the soul, we are drinking for the refreshment of the soul in its thirst. With or without the subsequently enjoined intervention of bread and wine, we are, in our

several respective measures, eating the bread and flesh of Christ and drinking His blood, not in the flesh, which profiteth nothing, not in the letter, which killeth, but in the Spirit, which giveth life.

Thus, understood proleptically, or understood naturally and simply, the sixth chapter of the fourth Gospel makes equally against the notion of any material, corporeal, or objective presence of Christ in the sacrament. All depends upon the mind of the believer and upon its acceptance and use of the Divine Spirit and His aid.

§ 8. *Narratives of the Institution.*

And now, from this consideration of metaphors, common to all languages, concerning "meat and drink" for the mind, concerning the "bread and wine" of Wisdom, concerning the "bread" from Heaven, and the "flesh and blood" of Jesus required to be eaten and drunk by all His disciples long before they could have any idea of the Lord's Supper and its institution, let us pass on to observe the Last Supper itself and the important points connected therewith in Holy Writ. For this purpose, it will be necessary to examine and collate the narratives of the Synoptists and of St. Paul.

A. *St. John's Silence, and the Light Thrown by Him on Our Subject.*

St. John, as is well known, supplies no record of the institution of the Supper as a rite to be repeated and perpetuated; but he tells us not a little that is important relative to the Last Supper and the blessed words and acts of Jesus on that occasion. The lesson in humility and ministering one to another, given by our Saviour in washing the disciples' feet, is set forth in the thirteenth

chapter of the fourth Gospel. Then, in the three following chapters, we find the words of warning by which Jesus strove, even at the last, to awaken the conscience of the traitor to a wholesome horror of the deed of treachery, which was already begun, and for whose completion Judas was eagerly seeking an opportunity. In those chapters, too, we have the consolation left by our Lord with His chosen ones, who were so soon to need comfort, not only because He would be taken from them by a cruel and ignominious death, but still more because that treatment would be embittered a hundredfold by their denial and desertion of Him.

And how was this comfort to be provided? How were these bereaved ones to be consoled? After a little while they should see him no more in the flesh: and that was for their good, for they were too apt to cling to whatever was material and objective about Him, whereas He had taught them and still taught, that even *His* flesh could profit them nothing; but when that was gone away into Heaven, then the Father would send to them the Spirit of Jesus, the Spirit of His truth, the Spirit of His comfort and exhortation[1]; and in that Spirit all His instructions would flow back into their memories with a new force and a new life.

In this Spirit let them keep His new commandment to love one another. In this Spirit let them be one in Him, as fruitful branches in the vine. In this Spirit let them teach others also, that they likewise might believe on Him through their words. In this Spirit let them all be one in union and communion with each other and with the Lord, even as He was one with the Father; and so, by the union of love and by the fellowship of service,

[1] τὸν παράκλητον, the Exhorter and Comforter.

which this Spirit of the Father and of the Son should bestow upon the apostles, and on all who should believe on Jesus through their words, let it be brought about that even "the world" (John xvii. 21) "may believe" that Jesus was sent by the Father.

Such is the strain of thought which runs through these four exquisite chapters of St. John; and if there be in them no categorical mention of the institution of the Lord's Supper, there is, assuredly, most distinct and abundant illustration of the manner and temper in which alone any holy and religious union and communion between the Lord and His people, and between His people among themselves, can be established or maintained. It must be, say these chapters, in perfect harmony with the sixth chapter, not in or by the material flesh of Christ, which profiteth nothing, but by the absence of that flesh and by the working of the Spirit of truth, and energy, and love, which giveth life, that such union and communion must be established and maintained.

B. *St. John and the Synoptists on the Date of the Last Supper.*

From this notice of St. John's teaching as to the spiritual, in opposition to the carnal and material, presence of Christ in all communion amongst believers, and especially in the Lord's Supper, let us proceed to observe one matter of detail, which is supplied to us by the fourth Gospel. From the expression of the Synoptists it might be inferred that the meal which Jesus kept, or "made"[1] (according to St. Matt. xxvi. 18), as the Passover or Paschal Supper, was the veritable Jewish feast of the 14th of the month Nisan. This, however, would be, ac-

[1] ποιῶ

cording to St. John, a misconception, and might mislead some into the idea, entertained, indeed, by the Ebionites of old, that our Lord's supper was a precise and formal *annual* feast, to be celebrated by Christians neither more nor less frequently than once in each year, and that exactly at the time when the Jews keep their festival of the Passover. Such a misconception, however, is rendered next to impossible, one would think, for the readers of St. John, inasmuch as he pointedly and repeatedly intimates that the Last Supper took place on the evening *before* the Passover. On that point, nothing can be more definite than the representations of St. John.

In the opening words of his thirteenth chapter, the date of the Last Supper is fixed "*before* the feast of the Passover;" and, similarly, in the twenty-ninth verse, some of the disciples are represented as thinking that words, addressed by our Lord to Judas, had reference to his buying the things they had need of "against the feast," on the obvious assumption that the feast, though at hand, was yet future. To the same effect it is recorded in St. John's eighteenth chapter, ver. 28, that when the Jewish authorities led Jesus from Caiaphas to Pilate's Prætorium, they would not themselves enter that Gentile "hall of judgment," "lest they should be defiled; but *that they might eat the Passover*." And, again, John xix. 31, we learn that "the Jews, therefore, because it was *the preparation*, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day (for that sabbath day was an high day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away."

The day of the crucifixion was the day of preparation for the Passover, whose occurrence that year on the sabbath day would make that day doubly important and

sacred. The crucifixion being ended and the bodies removed before the arrival of that evening when, in Jewish reckoning, that "high day" of sabbath and Passover commenced, it is evident that our Saviour's Last Supper, however much He treated it in Passover fashion and kept it as the Passover, must have been twenty-four hours previous to the beginning of the strict, legal festival of the Passover.

Here, then, is a point noticeable in the institution of the Lord's Supper. It was a feast like the Passover, and adopted instead of the Jewish Pascha, but it was not held on the exact day of the Jewish feast, and no imitation of the first institution, however literal or narrow, can bind men to its celebration only on the 14th of Nisan, or only as an annual solemnity.

Thus have we set forth an explanation, which has been thought to be admissible, of the day on which the Saviour instituted His Last Supper; but if any reader should challenge this explanation, and persist in bringing into view the fact that the Synoptists seem to fix the 14th of Nisan as the date of the Last Supper nearly or quite as definitely as the fourth Gospel fixes it on the 13th of Nisan, then we cannot claim to settle absolutely this long-debated point, but, for the purposes of our present investigation, the logical result must stand thus: namely, that on the evening of a certain day, whether Paschal or pro-Paschal being left uncertain and unascertainable by the indefiniteness of Holy Writ, Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper. The fair inference from this condition of things we take to be, that it is not essentially important that the Christian Supper should be celebrated on the 14th of Nisan only or at any other particular and definite time. The sequel may throw greater light on this sub-

ject; but, even at the outset, we are taught, with some distinctness, that our holy Supper is not a rite to be necessarily observed at some precise moment or hour of *time* and at no other.

C. *The Place of Institution.*

As to the *place* in which the Supper was instituted, it is interesting to observe that, whereas questions have been raised concerning the preliminaries in arranging for that place, there are certain points connected with it which remain beyond the reach of question. We learn (Mark xiv. 13, etc.) that our Saviour bade two of His disciples go before Him from the neighborhood of Jerusalem, where He then was, "into the city, and there shall meet you," were His words, "a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him. And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is My guestchamber" (*τὸ κατάλυμά μου*, according to the oldest manuscripts), "where I shall eat the Passover with My disciples? And he will show you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us."

What is the purport of this narrative? it has been asked. Did Jesus, out of His miraculous prevision, know that the water-carrier's labor would synchronize with the arrival of the two disciples? And did He similarly foreknow that the goodman of the particular house, to which was attached this water-carrier, would be willing to lend his guestchamber as asked? Is all this, as it might be by possibility, a stupendous miracle; or have we here an ordinary, though important, instance of the wisdom and mercy of our Master?

To this it may be answered that we have here, as usual, a simple and unexplained narrative of what Jesus did to

prepare for the much-desired Last Supper, and yet to avoid putting temptation in the way of the traitor. Judas had been with the Jewish authorities, and was now watching for an opportunity to deliver Jesus to them quietly, away from the crowd and the possibility of popular disturbance. If he should know that, at such an hour of the evening, his Master would be supping in a private house in Jerusalem, here would be the very means of secret betrayal and apprehension for which he longed. How much safer and more opportune this, than for him to proceed with a band of soldiers to Gethsemane, on the mere probability of finding Jesus there, in a haunt which He loved and to which He oft resorted. From the temptation of such an opportunity Judas would be screened, if Jesus did not divulge His intention as to the whereabouts of the coming Supper.

Besides, the disciples, like Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea, who were likely to have such houses in Jerusalem as that here indicated, were, up to the time of the crucifixion, not avowed followers of our Lord, but attached to Him secretly, for fear of the Jews.

Taking into view, then, the proper desire of self-preservation which would be felt by our Lord, and His righteous wish to shield the traitor from facilities which would enhance his frightful temptation, and considering, moreover, the secrecy of discipleship on the part of any who might be the Saviour's host on this occasion, it seems likely—especially in view of the reading, "Where is My guestchamber?"—that Jesus had made arrangements with His contemplated entertainer, whether it were Nicodemus, or Joseph of Arimathea, or some one else, that a water-carrier should await the arrival of James and John, and then conduct them to the appointed but undivulged

resort in which the pro-Paschal Supper was to be eaten. The importance which our Lord attached to this feast, and His vehement desire for its safe and peaceful celebration, render this explanation the more probable. Nor is it at all strange or unusual for the Evangelists to omit such details while recording events that tally with and suggest, if they do not absolutely require, such a comment.

Thus proceeds the simple and exquisite history of redemption as it presents itself to our minds; but let it be observed that, whether the designation of the place were miraculous, as is possible, or natural, as we have represented it, one point is clear: the *locale* of the Last Supper was a "guestchamber," or entertaining room, in some private house in Jerusalem. It was like hundreds of other "upper rooms" in the Holy City, which were wont to be placed by their owners at the disposal of families or parties who had come from the country to keep the feast in the place which Jehovah chose to set His name there. There is no trace of the exact locality: we can only guess at the owner's name. The scene of so august a rite is not represented as set apart in any special manner. Neither before nor after the Last Supper is this "guestchamber" marked off or consecrated as materially different from any other. In the ordinary upper room of some private house the Saviour partook, with His disciples, a meal which He substituted for the precise and rigidly-defined supper of the Passover.

D. *The Paschal Supper.*

And here it may be well to describe, in words borrowed from Neander's "History of the Church" (vol. i., p. 449, edit. Bohn), the mode of celebrating the Paschal Supper among the Jews:—

"The Jewish Passover was a feast of thanksgiving for the grace which the Almighty Creator, who causes the fruits of the earth to grow for the service of men, had bestowed on His people when He honored them with His *especial guidance*, after delivering them from the Egyptian bondage. Every father of a family, who kept the Passover with his household and distributed wine and bread among the guests, praised God, who had bestowed these fruits of the earth on man, for the favor He had shown to *His own* peculiar people. For this reason the cup of wine over which the giving of thanks was pronounced was called the cup of thanksgiving."

It is alleged that, in the course of the ordinary Jewish Passover, three or four cups of wine were passed round for the guests with blessing and thanksgiving similar to that described above.

And now, keeping this idea of the Jewish Passover in mind, and remembering that Jesus was keeping a feast either identical with that Jewish rite, as some say, or in lieu of it, as others say with perhaps greater probability, let us proceed to observe the several particulars as recorded in the sacred narratives of the Synoptists and St. Paul.

E. *Simple Introduction of the Subject by the Synoptists.*

The first point which calls for attention is the simple, natural way in which the history of so solemn an event as the institution of the Lord's Supper is introduced. The two earliest Evangelists agree in their very words, "as they did eat," as they were eating, in the course of their meal, the institution occurred. Whether a lamb was part of the meal we know not, nor whether the bitter herbs and all the characteristics of a normal Passover

were employed; but we are told that there was a supper. Something they ate; and, in the course of the eating of that meal, over and above the other words and discourses recorded by the four Evangelists, certain events took place which have been the root and origin of what is deemed the holiest part of later Christian worship.

One particular, antecedent, according to St. Luke, to these events, is mentioned by the third Evangelist alone. At some comparatively early point in the Supper, if St. Luke's narrative is precise in arranging the series of occurrences, Jesus (Luke xxii. 17) "took a cup and gave thanks, and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." Subsequent, according to St. Luke, upon these words, with their solemn intimation that a great crisis in the development of the divine kingdom was at hand, came the first part of the words of institution.

F. (*a.*) *Parallel Histories, by St. Paul and the Synoptists, referring to the Bread.*

Before comparing them in their fourfold form, let it be observed that what the sacred narrative sets before us is a very general sketch of a domestic meal, in *lieu* of the Passover, in an upper room of a private house in Jerusalem. That such a meal was being partaken of by the apostles with our Saviour is all we learn with certainty up to this point.

And now let us compare the four histories of what followed:

MATT. xxvi. 26.	MARK xiv. 22.
"But as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My body."	"And as they were eating, He took bread and blessed, and brake, and gave to them, and said, Take: this is My body."

Luke xxii. 19.	1 Cor. xi. 23-24.
"And He took bread,	"The Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was betrayed, took bread,
and gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them, and said,	and gave thanks, and brake, and said,
This is My body which is being given for you; this do for My remembrance."	This is My body which is for you; this do for My remembrance."

(*b.*) *Comments on these Histories.*

In these parallel columns we have the most reliable readings of the several passages quoted. They are given as Tischendorf gives them, upon the authority of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine manuscripts. They are translated as literally as possible, and are so arranged as to show their substantial agreement in the points common to more than one narrative.

Wholly unimportant is the usage of "but" by St. Matthew, instead of "and" by St. Mark; and, perhaps, equally unimportant would be the introduction of the definite article by the Alexandrine copy of the first Evangelist, "the bread," in place of "bread" in the other three histories.

(i.) "*Blessing*," *or* "*Giving of Thanks.*"

More interesting is the variation between "blessing" the bread mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Mark, and "giving thanks" for it, as described by St. Luke and St. Paul. The Alexandrine manuscript of the first Gospel reads, indeed, "gave thanks" instead of "blessed"; but the other two most ancient manuscripts agree in reading "blessed." Whether our Lord both gave thanks and blessed, or whether His blessing was identical with His giving of thanks, we have here one of the merely verbal variations which are chiefly useful as teaching us how remote are the sacred writings from giving a precise literal transcript of the very words employed by our Saviour.

(ii.) *The Words,* "*Take, eat.*"

It is not a little striking that the greatest variations in the narratives are found just in those words of institution which, from certain points of view, men would be prone to regard as most important, and as requiring to be handed down with most literal exactness.

There is a *consensus* of the three oldest manuscripts in omitting the word "eat" in St. Mark; and they are similarly agreed in omitting the words "given" and "broken" in St. Paul's narrative. Only the Alexandrine manuscript inserts the word "Take" (in St. Luke) before "This is My body," etc.

(iii.) *The Body* "*given,*" *etc.*

Very pointed is the significance of the words in which St. Luke alone tells us that our Lord described His body as "being," in the then present time, "given,"[1] for man. It is no declaration as to the past, as if there had already occurred on earth any realization of the eternal purpose of God concerning the "Lamb slain[2] before the foundation of the world."

In our Saviour's flesh "being given," in that then present time, there is no intimation that His sacrifice was often, or perpetually, to be repeated or continued in the future. Here, on the contrary, is a record that, in the then present time, was realized, once for all, the eternal purpose of God. Christ appeared (Heb. ix. 26) now once in the end of the world, and gave his flesh to be, in that then present time, a "full, perfect, and suffi-

[1] διδόμενον.

[2] ἐσφαγμένον. *Vide* Rev. xiii. 8, and Rev. xvii. 8. This last passage makes it highly probable, as De Wette long ago observed, that the words, "from the foundation of the world," in Rev. xiii. 8, belong to "written," and not to "slain." In this view of the expression, it would contain no difficulty for our consideration in this essay. We have, however, preferred adopting the prevalent and popular translation in our text above.

cient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Surely, we should miss much if we had not this portion of our Lord's utterance; and yet it is only from one of the four histories that we learn it, St. Paul's parallel expression, "being broken," being of less than doubtful genuineness.

(iv.) "*This Do for My Remembrance.*"

Similarly, if it were not for the records of St. Luke and St. Paul, we should be without those words, "This do for My remembrance," which, to the vast majority of believers, make the participation of bread, at least in memory of Christ, of abiding and perpetual obligation. So important and instructive are the fuller forms of the words of institution.

(v.) *Omissions Instructive.*

We should notice, before quitting for a time this first part of the institution, that the actual and obvious omissions, occurring in the briefer forms of institution, render it conceivable that even the fullest of the four existing records may be an abbreviation of our Saviour's entire words. As St. Matthew and St. Mark obviously epitomize the words narrated by St. Luke and St. Paul, so these two last-named writers may possibly have given only an abbreviation of our Saviour's full utterance. They *have* omitted the "Take, eat," of which St. Matthew tells us. They have omitted to mention that the memorial rite was instituted in the course of the pro-Paschal meal. They *may have* omitted other words, of which neither of the two first Evangelists supplies a record. How important is this line of observation, and how far it is confirmed and justified by indirect evidence

of a very forcible character, will become apparent as we proceed in our study of the subject.

G. (*a.*) *Parallel Histories of St. Paul and the Synoptists, referring to the Wine.*

And now let us set forth in parallel columns the four narratives of the second part of the institution :—

MATT. xxvi. 27, etc.

"And He took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink of it, all of you: for this is My blood of the covenant, which is being shed for many for remission of sins.
But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom."

MARK xiv. 23, etc.

"And He took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them: and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, This is My blood of the covenant, which is being shed for many.
Verily I say unto you, I will never drink again of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

LUKE xxii. 20.

"And in like manner the cup after supper, saying, This cup [is] the new covenant in My blood, which is being shed for you."

1 COR. xi. 25.

"In like manner, also, the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in My blood.

This do, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance."

(*b.*) *Comments on these Histories.*

(i.) *Epithet "New" before "Covenant."*

In closely examining these histories, it will be noticed that before the word "covenant," in the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark, the epithet "new," to which the received version has accustomed us, is omitted. This omission, unimportant to the signification, has been made in accordance with the text of the oldest manuscripts, the Sinaitic and the Vatican, although it is not sanctioned by the Alexandrine.

(ii.) *The Blood-shedding once for all.*

In this part of the institution, as in the former, the shedding of the Saviour's blood, like the giving of His body, is described as an event occurring, once for all, in

that then present time. The one act of sacrifice, once offered, is detached from the divine idea, intention, or purpose, in which the Lamb had been slain from the foundation of the world. The blood was being shed in Jesus' devotion of Himself, in that wicked deed to which Judas and the Jewish authorities had already set their hands. It was a present action, being once performed without any hint or intimation that its repetition in time to come was possible. Blood which is "being shed" is spoken of, but all allusion to future reiteration of the sacrifice, or to continued offering up of the blood, is as completely absent from this historical narrative, as it is pointedly excluded by passage after passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where we read (ix. 12), "By His own blood He entered in *once* into the holy place;" "Nor yet" (ix. 25, 26, 28) "that He should offer Himself often . . . for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now *once* in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself;" and again, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many;" and yet again (x. 10), "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all;*" and (verses 12, 14) "This man, after He had offered *one* sacrifice for sins for ever,[1] sat down on the right hand of God . . . . for by *one* offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

So completely was the blood-shedding and offering of our Lord an act present in the time of that one terrible Passion, and never to be repeated. He, the great High-Priest, would plead for us, and intercede according to the will of God, at God's right hand. What part in that pleading should be borne by the Saviour's making mention

[1] εις το διηνεκες.

of His blood and His life as the ransom for all men (1 Tim. ii. 4), we may thankfully and piously imagine. Nay, we may plead for mercy through that blood ourselves; but the shedding of it—that terrific sacrifice—was an act once witnessed in the world and never to be repeated. Thus entirely does the record of the Evangelists, "blood *being shed*," harmonize with the general teaching of Holy Writ in excluding all idea of a recurrence or perpetuation of that blood-shedding, as of that giving of Christ's body, either by man on earth or by the Lord Himself in heaven.

(iii.) *The Wine "after" the Supper.*

To return, however, to another point in the comparison of our records. It is very interesting to observe, in the words of St. Luke and St. Paul, that whereas the bread had been broken and distributed *during* the Supper, it was "*after*" the Supper that the wine was given in the cup of blessing.

(iv.) "*Drink of it, all of you.*"

Curiously interesting and instructive in the face of mediæval superstition, which, for fear of spilling a drop of the wine, withheld the cup from the laity, is the precept in St. Matthew, "Drink of it, all of you," and the record in St. Mark, "They all drank of it." Of course, those who, in the teeth of these passages, withhold the cup from the laity, make a distinction between *all* the apostles and *all* believers; and, upon this distinction, they say that Christ enjoined participation in the cup to all the apostles, but not to all Christians. If this line of argument were valid, it would prove too much, for it would make the entire duty of celebrating the Lord's Supper obligatory on the apostles only.

For the lay people there would be no duty, nor any right, to perpetuate the Lord's Supper until His coming again. And thus it appears that if the Supper be in any part for *all believers*, as the withholders of the cup agree with us in teaching, then the words, "Drink of it, all of you," are addressed as much to all Christians as is any other portion of the institution; and, in this point of view, they form a notable comment on the manner in which mediæval superstition has defied alike the letter and the spirit of our Lord's command, while yielding to the dictates of its own fanciful scrupulosity.

(v.) *Catholicity of Redemption.*

In connection with this width and catholicity of the intent of our Lord, alike when He gave the bread and the wine, should be noticed the variations of our first three columns—"Blood which is being shed for you" (St. Luke); "Which is being shed for many" (St. Mark); and "Which is being shed for many for remission of sins" (St. Matthew). If the mediæval superstition, which attempts to narrow the recipients of the cup to the circle of the apostles only, were right, the "you" of St. Luke would similarly denote the limited body of the apostles. This idea is in itself abhorrent to every scriptural and catholic conviction regarding God's love for "the world," His unwillingness that any should perish, His wish that all should be saved; but, moreover, if St. Luke's "you" be thus meant to include only the apostles, it will become diametrically opposed to the "many" for whom St. Mark and St. Matthew agree in representing our Saviour as declaring that His blood was being shed.

Here, then, is proof, if proof were wanted, that the cup of blessing, like the precious blood-shedding itself, was

intended "for you and for many," as the happy words of the Liturgy express it. And, indeed, the loving heart that has been touched with even a spark of the divine philanthropy must, at the sound of this word "many," crave to learn, How many? Nor is the answer far to seek. Immediately after these words were spoken, the blessed Lord Himself, in His great prayer (John xvii. 20), expands such apparently limited terms by His supplication to the Father, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which believe on Me through their word."

Here is the means of harmony and reconciliation supplied to us by Christ Himself, between the "many" for whom He was shedding His blood, the "many" (Matt. xx. 28) for whom He came to minister and give His life a ransom, and the statement of St. Paul (1 Tim. ii. 6) that Christ was "a ransom *for all men*." God, says the same apostle (1 Tim. iv. 10), "is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe." This the measure, the only measure, of the "many" for whom Jesus shed His blood. In the divine wish the "many" are "all men." Only by abusing our tremendous responsibility of freedom, in opposition to that wish of God, can we limit this multitude of the "many" so that it shall be less than equivalent to "all."

(vi.) *Frequency of Celebration.*

Akin to this divinely intended catholicity of participation in the wine of the Lord's Supper, no less than in the redemption wrought by our Saviour, is the instruction as to the frequency of the Supper's celebration according to Christ's purpose and injunction, "This do, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance." That St. Paul should

have recorded this part of our Lord's institution is a fact no less happy and momentous than his being its sole reporter is curious and pregnant with instruction. In the latter aspect of the matter, how striking is it that words of such grave importance should have been omitted by three out of our four histories of the event!

What a clear intimation is here afforded us of the summary and suggestive sketch of all our Saviour did and said which is supplied to us in the narratives of the New Testament. A spirit is in those sketches that marvellously touches and convicts and elevates our human spirits; but if any reader neglect or lose the clue supplied by this spirit of Christ, the spirit of truth and love and freedom—if any reader surrender himself to the mere letter even of this holy record—especially if he attempt to construct out of the letter of this blessed book, apart from its holy and glorious spirit, precise, logical, and penal definitions which shall enslave his own thoughts or curtail the liberty of other men—let him beware lest the word or text, possibly the isolated word or text, on which he depends and which is out of harmony with the general analogy of Holy Writ, may have been surrounded, on its utterance by the Lord, by other terms and other phrases, such as would have softened down the hardness with which our supposed literalist is inclined to invest it.

So true is it, in this sense as in all senses, that the letter killeth and the spirit giveth life. This lesson of charity and wisdom we may well learn from the proved and important omissions occurring in some portions of the sacred volume, from the various readings and various arrangements of words to be met with so frequently in

other portions, and not least in the history of the institution of the sacred Supper.

Without St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, we might, in spite of what has been noticed above, have supposed that the Supper of the Lord was, after the manner of some Ebionites, to be commemorated as only an annual Christian Passover. Or it might have been regarded as a monthly, a weekly, or, at most, a daily celebration that was alone befitting. No, says the apostle, "This do, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance." Whenever thirst oppresses you and you are refreshed by any beverage, "*as oft as ye drink*," be it by night or by day, be it seven times in the twenty-four hours, be it when it may, where it may, and (apparently) of whatsoever beverage it may chance—"as oft as ye drink," do this for My remembrance.

"Do this:" Do what? Assuredly, thank God and bless Him for His gifts of nature and of grace: assuredly, impart to others of the cup of wine, the spring of water, the wells of salvation, the bread that nourishes man's body and the living bread that feeds his soul—impart of all to your fellow-men: "this do," all this, in the humblest and yet most bounteous spirit, do it: and do it "for My remembrance," recollecting how I broke the bread and shared it with you, how I took the cup and gave it to you all, how I gave myself, My life, My will, My all, a sacrifice and a ransom to redeem you and all men.

In whatever special manner you may do this, at the family meal, or in the friendly gathering, or in the congregation (ἐκκλησία) of believers, yet forget it not; even in the solitude of your journeying through unfrequented places, forget it not: "Do this, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance." Well might St. Paul exclaim

(1 Cor. x. 31), "Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." So, ceremonially or unceremonially, are we to remember Christ and His sacrifice and His blessed salvation; so to cultivate helpfulness and fellowship with our fellow-men: so to live in a spirit of thankful blessing of God for all His gifts and all His inestimable grace.

(vii.) *Error of "Fasting Communion," etc.*

What a wealth of truth and piety is in the few words which, but for St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, would have been lost and forgotten, like so many of the precious sayings that fell from the lips of Him who spake as never man spake. What a grafting is here enjoined of all our life, day by day, hour by hour, into oneness with God in Christ and into communion with all men, specially with them that believe. "This do, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance." What a correction for the error and superstition of those who, leaning on the decisions of a handful of men assembled in one city or another as councils, not of the whole Church, but of some portion of it, have said, Do this only when you have placed an interval of sleep, or of night, or of so-called "fasting" between your last meal and your participation of the Lord's Supper.

Of such "fasting communion," or such exclusively early communion, the sacred volume of the New Testament knows nothing, either in the letter or the spirit of it. These traditions are of men, and, like others of older date, they make the commandments of God of none effect; for, whereas He, in whom the Father was manifested, said, "Do this, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance

of Me," the traditions say, Do this only before midday, and after ye have fasted awhile.

Surely, in face of the attempt to resuscitate such a dream of mediæval darkness, we may well be reminded of Scripture teaching and divine appointment in this matter.

(viii.) *The "New" Fruit of the Vine.*

In looking over the narratives of the institution, as set in parallel columns above, it will be observed that the first two Evangelists append to their record a solemn statement by our Lord, to the effect that He would not again drink of the fruit of the vine, till He should drink it new with His disciples in the kingdom of God. Here is a declaration which might well prepare those who heard it for the near approach of some great crisis in their relationships, and in those of the world, with Jesus and the Father. Such a change was imminent as would revolutionize every detail of life. Old things would be passed away; behold, all things would be new.

The whole creation, travailing in pain together, would put on a fresh phase in its subjection and subserviency to the sons of God. The very fruit of the vine would henceforth be surrounded by such novel association of thought, of gratitude to God and Christ, and of fellowship amongst men, that it would be "new" in the kingdom of God, which itself, by the death and resurrection of the Saviour, would be advanced by a new and unique development: and all this was so near at hand, that this was the Last Supper, the last meal, the last drinking of the cup with the Master, ere it should come to pass. "Verily I say unto you, I will never drink again of this

fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom."

These important words are altogether omitted in St. Paul's description of the Last Supper; but St. Luke, though he fails to place them *after* the institution, as do St. Matthew and St. Mark, has recorded them, as we have seen, with variations and additions, as having been spoken *before* the institution. In the third Evangelist, they bear this form (Luke xxii. 15—18): "With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you that I will never eat of it again, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And He took a cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come."

The different position occupied by these words in the third Gospel, as compared with the two first, is full of instruction for those who, in their devout adoration of the Saviour, wish to learn as much as possible of the principles and method on which the evangelical histories were constructed and composed. If Jesus spoke these words both before and after the institution—a supposition which is possible, but surely in the highest degree improbable—then each of the three historians omits one of the repeated utterances, and we are shown an instance of evangelic condensation of our Saviour's words.

But if, as is more likely, the words were only spoken once, and that in the fuller form indicated by St. Luke, with reference to eating the Passover, as well as drinking the wine; then, in the displacement by one or other historian, and in the abridgment by the two later Evangelists, as well as in the variations between the

phrases, "until I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom," "until I drink it new in the kingdom of God," "until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God," "until the kingdom of God shall come"—in such displacement, and abridgment, and variations we are again taught how the Gospels are the sacred instrument for awakening and sustaining the spirit of Christianity in all devout and earnest students, but are not a literal transcript of words and sentences out of which, by the mere formularies of logical definition and inference, apart from the temper of beneficence, love, and salvation, sentences may be constructed which shall be reliable dogmas of the faith.

These displacements, variations, and abridgments show how necessary it is that, whenever two or more versions of any event can be found in Holy Writ, we should place them in juxtaposition, and, instead of converting an isolated passage from one version into some formulary and "shibboleth" of party, we should diligently endeavor to ascertain as nearly as possible the true teaching and the sanctifying spirit of the Saviour in the fullest statement.

An illustration of the manner in which different records of the same divine utterance throw light upon one another is afforded to us in the several expressions which, as set forth above, go to confirm the view we have given of the sense in which Jesus would drink of the fruit of the vine "*new*" in the days when the kingdom of God should be come, and when, therefore, the Passover feast and its cup of blessing, hitherto associated chiefly with Jewish rescue from Egyptian bondage, would be *fulfilled*, and so would be replete with new associations touching deliverance from the servitude and selfishness of sin into the glorious liberty of righteousness, into the holy broth-

erhood of men, into the blessed sonship with Christ unto the Father.

"New," indeed, would be such a fulfilled Passover; "new," indeed, such unleavened bread of sincerity and truth; "new," indeed, such a cup of blessing; "new," indeed, the Lamb without blemish, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, Christ our Passover, who is sacrificed for us; "new," indeed, each part of the sacred rite, the fulfilment, the perfecting, the substance of that which had only been foreshadowed in the weak and beggarly elements of the law; "new," indeed, and in marked and glorious contrast with that which waxed old and decayed, and was ready to vanish away; "new," indeed, this substitution by Christ of the spirit of righteousness and life for the letter of condemnation and death.

But this, full as it is of the "new" spirit of Christ, remote as it is from any teaching of a material presence of Jesus in each repeated commemoration of His Last Supper, is very far from being all that we are taught by a careful collation of the several histories of the institution.

(ix.) *St. Luke's Notice of Wine Given before the Bread.*

We have seen that whilst St. Luke gives us, in some respects, the more complete statement of our Saviour's words as to His not again eating and drinking till all was "fulfilled," and so made *new* by fresh and ennobling associations in the kingdom of God, that that Evangelist stands by himself in contra-distinction from the two who place their representation of those words after the institution. As we accept St. Luke's fuller statement, so we yield our

judgment to the testimonies of Matthew and Mark on the point in which they are agreed, namely, that those words of Jesus were spoken *after* the institution.

And, in this line of thought, it is not unimportant to observe how, subsequently to our Lord's blessing and thanksgiving over the bread and wine, and subsequently to the disciples' partaking of those elements, one of them is still designated "the fruit of the vine" (St. Luke), and "*this* fruit of the vine" (St. Matthew). Surely, if it had been intended by Jesus, or by the Evangelists, to teach us that the wine had undergone an objective change, and was now become His blood, objectively or materially, words could hardly have been less happily chosen than these, "This fruit of the vine." If language on the lips of the Saviour or from the pens of the Evangelists have any definite and intelligible meaning, here is a indication that the wine was still the fruit of the vine, and nothing more and nothing less *objectively*, whatever, *subjectively*, might be the association of thought and emotion rightly and piously to be connected therewith.

(x.) *Christ's Participation in the New Fruit of the Vine.*

But even this is not the only warning against materializing spiritual things furnished to us by an attentive study of the primal records of our Lord's institution of the Supper. For this passage of those primal records represents Jesus as implying that He would participate with His disciples in the drinking of the fruit of the vine, new, in the kingdom of God. If the Master had said he would give His disciples of the fruit of the vine, new, in His Father's kingdom, it would not have countenanced the belief that wine in the Supper became objectively differentiated or materially changed from the fruit

of the vine; but what the Saviour intimates is, I will drink of this fruit of the vine, new, with you in the kingdom of God.

Let any man, who is not revolted at the abhorrent idea, image to himself Jesus drinking, not the fruit of the vine, but His own blood, *objectively*. So repulsive a thought finds no place in Scripture, and might well forbid our interpreting literally any isolated passage, if such did exist, which would, when so literally interpreted, lead directly and inevitably to results intolerable, as a matter of taste, and impious in connection with God and Christ. When we meet with precepts enjoining or seeming to encourage the hatred of our parents, the mutilation or dismemberment of ourselves, or the perpetration of aught that is abhorrent, we pity the error of Origen, and feel that metaphors must not be pressed to absurd and wicked lengths, lest here again the letter be found to kill just as truly as the spirit giveth life.

If, then, there even were any text which taught that the bread in the Supper became objectively changed into the flesh of Christ, and the wine into His blood, this portion of the Gospel narrative would compel us to interpret that text as metaphorical on pain of becoming blasphemous and cannibalistic. But we have seen thus far, alike in examining the general usage of all languages and the phraseology of the Old and New Testaments, that there is distinctest instruction given us that Wisdom's bread and Wisdom's wine, the flesh of the Son of man and His blood, are metaphors enjoining the union or embodiment which is to be effected between us and Wisdom, between our spirits and the Spirit of our divine Master.

In the institution of the Supper we have also seen these metaphors conjoined with symbols: the symbol of bread

with the metaphor of Christ's body, so that as often as we partake of the former we may thankfully remember the latter, and more nearly come to Christ our Saviour; the symbol of wine with the metaphor of Christ's blood, so that as oft as we drink we may thankfully remember the Lord's dying for us, and, more vividly realizing and believing on Him, may be more thoroughly in union with Him and in communion with our fellow-men and fellow-believers.

All this has been clear enough as the sacred records have been investigated; but, instead of showing us any trace of a material transformation in the elements of bread and wine, they have warned us that all our advantage is to be drawn, not from any flesh, not even from the flesh of Jesus Himself, but only and solely from the spirit which breathes through His divine words of comfort, love, and truth. Each particular of time and place and detail in the narrative has, thus far, made as strongly against any literal, and material, and objective interpretation of the figures and symbols in the Supper, as it has made distinctly in favor of their subjective and spiritual exegesis.

II. (*a.*) *Christ's Words in Administering the Bread and Wine.*

It remains, however, for us to examine carefully the very core of this matter—the words, namely, with which our Saviour gave the bread and delivered the cup: and in these words men have sometimes thought there was to be found justification for a belief in such objective change in the bread and wine as is designated at one time "transubstantiation," at another time "consubstantiation," and yet again "insubstantiation." At this point

it will be useful to refer to the words of institution, as given in parallel columns on pages 22 and 25 of this essay.

(*b.*) *Comments on the Administration.*

(i.) *From Briefest Forms, What Follows?*

At the outset, the two first Evangelists inform us that Jesus said, "Take" (Mark), or "Take, eat" (Matthew); "this is My body." Now let us suppose, for instruction's sake, that which is only an hypothesis, however, and does not, happily, hold good in fact. Let us suppose that these briefest words of administration were all we knew of what Jesus said as He administered. And let it be, moreover, supposed, contrary to the facts again, that, on our Lord's giving the cup, it was only recorded that He said, "This is My blood." From this hypothesis, what would follow as to the necessity of believing in any objective change in the bread and wine?

If we were to forget all that has hitherto been adduced against materialistic tendencies in the worship of Him who is a Spirit, and seeks to be worshipped in spirit and in truth, there would still remain the Saviour's declarations that He is "the good shepherd" (John x. 11), that He is "the door of the sheep" (John x. 7), and that He is "the true vine, and His Father is the husbandman" (John xv. 1), or that He is "the vine, and ye (His disciples) are the branches."

There would remain these and not a few other like employments of metaphor by the Master: and until interpreters shall be prepared to insist that Christ's disciples are objectively changed from men into sheep; that the Eternal and Unchangeable is objectively changed into a "husbandman" (γεωργός in the Greek): that our blessed Lord

is objectively changed into a "shepherd" of real sheep, and not of men; or that He is objectively changed into the "door," or gate, of a sheepfold; or He into an objective vine and we into objective branches;—until interpreters are prepared for these extravagant and well-nigh, if not quite, blasphemous and unnecessary courses, they must, to be consistent, confine metaphoric and symbolic language to figurative, prudent, and pious significations alike when it is said, "This bread is My body," or "This wine is My blood," or "I am the door," or "I am the good shepherd," or "I am the true vine," or "Ye are branches," or "Ye are sheep," or "My Father is the husbandman."

Against a literal, and objective, and materializing interpretation the special senses testify; for there was the body of Jesus visibly and tangibly present with the disciples, apart from both the bread and the wine. The dictates of common sense and good taste and piety bear similar testimony against any objective interpretation, as may be perceived the moment we apply such interpretation to any of the metaphors in connection with which familiarity has not blunted our sense of the indecorous and the impious.

Faith, likewise, bears testimony to the same effect against any objective or material presence of Christ's body and blood on earth; for it is guided by the teaching of Holy Writ, that Jesus, with His glorified body, has ascended to the Father's right hand, and there sitteth awaiting the subjection of His enemies, and interceding for us. Faith bears this testimony as to Jesus being absent, objectively and carnally, from all bread and wine and other things on earth. Faith apprehends the truth, that it is good for us Jesus should thus go to the Father

and leave us, and send us, instead of His bodily or objective presence, the blessed and abiding Spirit, the Guide and Comforter, to be ever present with us, to knock at the doors of our hearts, to sup with any who will open to Him, to be present with each and with all till the end of the world.

Thus would faith and common sense and piety combine with the dictates of a consistent exegesis in forbidding us to interpret, objectively or materially, the phrases, "This is My body," "This is My blood," even if they stood—as, however, they do not stand—absolutely and by themselves in the sacred narrative of the Lord's institution and administration of the Supper.

(ii.) *Four Records of the Administration.*

But these important phrases do not so stand, absolutely and by themselves, and without limitation or definition in the narrative of the Apostle and Evangelists. For the sake of distinctness, let us reproduce the words of administration of the bread and wine by the Lord in their fourfold form :—

MATT. xxvi. 26–28.

"Take, eat ; this is My body.
Drink of it, all of you: for this is My blood of the covenant, which is being shed for many for remission of sins."

MARK, xiv. 22–24.

"Take: this is My body.
This is My blood of the covenant, which is being shed for many."

LUKE xxii. 19, 20.

"This is My body which is being given for you.
This do for My remembrance.
This cup [is] the new covenant in My blood, which is being shed for you."

1 COR. xi. 23–25.

"This is My body, which is for you.
This do for My remembrance.
This cup is the new covenant in My blood.
This do, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance."

To several points in connection with these solemn words, our attention has already been directed. Of the extent of the "many" for whom Christ suffered, and of the divine mercy as wishing that "many" to be equiva-

lent to the "*all* men" for whom Christ gave Himself a ransom (1 Tim. ii. 6), we shall at present say no more. Neither need we add anything concerning the precept that *all* should drink of the cup. Nor will we further insist on the frequency, the constantly-recurring frequency, with which our blessed Saviour ought to be remembered and sympathized with, and communion with Him and His people participated in by us all.

(iii.) *Phrase "For Remission of Sins."*

St. Matthew's mention of Christ's blood being shed "for remission of sins" calls for the remark that "remission" (ἄφεσις in the Greek) signifies *putting away*, and denotes not only God's putting away, or remitting, or forgiving sins, but also signifies man's putting away, dismissing, or desisting from sins. When, here or elsewhere in the New Testament, we read of the remission of sins and of Christ dying for that object, let it be borne in mind that Christ died that God might put away sin by remitting it, and that man might put away sin by dismissing it. God in Christ has done everything for the remission of sins; but unless man responds to this divine inception of grace by dismissing sin and abandoning it on his part, the sin must remain, and man's guilt will be that he nullifies and frustrates God's merciful wish and the gracious work of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

(iv.) *Variations in the Records.*

This pregnant truth concerning "remission of sins" we could not fail to offer to our reader on the suggestion of St. Matthew. But, once more, how striking is the fact that only St. Matthew records our Lord's introduction of these words into the institution and administration of the Last Supper. And, in a similar vein of in-

struction, how noteworthy is it that, as becomes conspicuous in the parallel columns just employed, in so solemn a matter as this, of the Lord's Supper and its institution, no two of the evangelic records are entirely agreed. Even in the briefest form of administering the bread, where St. Matthew writes, "Take, eat; this is My body," St. Mark, as shown by the three oldest existing manuscripts, omits the word "eat." So true is it, as should ever be borne in mind, that in the Lord's Supper, as in everything connected with the Gospel narratives and with the entirety of Christianity, it is the spirit that giveth life, and to depend on the letter is fatal.

(v.) *Habit of Abbreviating the Words of Christ's Administration.*

Few passages of Scripture more need, and few will better repay, a minute and careful study and comparison than those which record the words of our Saviour in administering the Last Supper, and, strange as it must seem, few passages appear to have received so little diligent and thorough examination.

"This is My body," and "This is My blood,"—these are the words which ring in men's ears, and cleave to their memories, and are conspicuous in their controversies, as if they were the sole words of Jesus at the Supper, or, at least, were the centre and core and essence of what was spoken by the Lord, as if all His other sayings on that occasion were incidental and of less moment.

(vi.) *St. Luke and St. Paul on the Administering of the Wine.*

Let us now collate the parallel histories given above, and ascertain what they may teach us. From the popularly quoted and almost exclusively remembered phrases,

"This is My body," and "This is My blood," the point of widest divergence, and therefore, probably, the point of best illustration and most useful instruction, is to be found in the histories supplied by St. Luke and St. Paul with reference to the wine. These histories inform us that our Lord's words, in giving the wine, were, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood." St. Luke adds, "which is being shed for you."

Here is a statement which looks, at the first glance, very different from that which is all but exclusively quoted and relied upon in support of the notion of an objective change in the elements of bread and wine. Instead of "This is My blood," "This cup is the new covenant in My blood" is our various reading; and this various reading is furnished to us by two out of the four historians of the event, those two being St. Luke the Evangelist, and St. Paul the Apostle, whose first Epistle to the Corinthians supplies us with what is, as says Dean Stanley (Cor. vol. i., p. 241), "probably the earliest record of the institution of the Eucharist."

(vii.) *The Records Differing, which Is Our Better Guide?*

The question which must press itself upon the attention of the diligent and unprejudiced reader of these two representations of our Saviour's words is, What did Jesus say? Were His words, "This cup is the new covenant," or were they, "This is My blood"?

It is perfectly clear that the two different records of the Lord's words cannot *both* be literally exact, correct, and complete. If Jesus said, "This cup is the new covenant," He cannot also, with the same breath, at the same moment, have said, "This is My blood." It is to

be observed that in each of the records, looked at in their entirety, both the phrases occur. From neither of them is the word "blood" wholly absent. In both, the term "covenant" is mentioned. In one, Jesus speaks of "My blood of the covenant"; in the other, of "the new covenant in My blood." Which was the precise utterance of Jesus? If we cannot positively decide that question, what a frail basis will be left for the theory of an objective change in the elements, resting, as that theory does in the main, upon words of institution, which are, at least, as likely to have been "This cup is the new covenant," as "This is My blood!"

The stupendous miracles of objective change in the elements will rest on the doubtful issue, "Did St. Paul and St. Luke more accurately record the words of Jesus on this occasion, or must the credit of greater accuracy in this case be awarded to St. Matthew and St. Mark? Is such dubiety in the evidence a sufficient basis for any miracle? Still more, is it sufficient to uphold a miracle of objective change in the bread and wine against the contravening testimony, as we have seen, of sense, of common sense, of taste, and of faith itself? We will venture to assert, at all events, that no other Christian miracle rests upon testimony so slender and so questionable.

(viii.) *Failing an Answer, What Follows?*

Nay, we will acknowledge ourselves convinced that, if it be impossible to decide which is the more genuine and exact record of the words employed by Jesus, the case must stand thus:—The four historians—or two of them, at least—whatever theory of their inspiration may be adopted, cannot have thought it a matter of supreme im-

portance to give their readers the *ipsissima verba* in this matter. They must have attached little weight to the enormous doctrines of objective change insisted upon by certain modern teachers, if, indeed, they had any conception whatever of such objective change; and, furthermore, if both the discrepant records are to stand as substantially true and historical, then the inference seems inevitable that Jesus, in giving the wine after His Last Supper, spoke something about its being His blood of the covenant in such a sense and with such a meaning that His words could be reported, not as insisting upon an objective change of wine into blood, but as declaring that the cup of wine was, *in some sense*, the new covenant in His blood.

(ix.) *The Cup a "Covenant."*

A covenant is a promise in words spoken or in words written. Obviously and confessedly on all sides, the cup of wine was not metamorphosed, or objectively changed, into a covenant in the sense of the sound of words spoken, or into a covenant in the sense of a piece of parchment or papyrus with words inscribed thereon. No one sets up this pretence of transubstantiation upon the words, "This cup is the new covenant." Then why, or with what appearance of reason or reverence, can the theory of wine being objectively changed into blood be originated and upheld upon the parallel and (at most) explanatory phrase, "This is My blood of the covenant"?

If the words, "This cup is the new covenant," are, confessedly, a statement that there is a connecting association of thought and memory between the wine and the covenant—that the wine is a token and reminder of the covenant, by what fair process of interpretation can the parallel utterance be denied the exposition which makes

it a statement that there is a connecting association of thought and memory between the wine and the blood of Jesus—that the wine is a token and reminder of the blood of Jesus?

(x.) *The Simpler Form of Administering the Wine.*

Thus much must be said on the supposition that one of our discrepant records has no greater appearance or evidence of exactness than the other. Now, however, we proceed to inquire into this important point—what may be the meaning of these words, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood which is being shed for you." Do they yield any plain and natural signification? As to the connection between blood and a covenant with Jehovah, the Jewish mind was quite familiar with this. When, for example, Moses had been called up into the mountain, and had received and written all the words of the Lord, "he took (Exod. xxiv. 7, 8) "the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood" (of the sacrifice just slain), "and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold *the blood of the covenant*, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words."

Besides this historical association of the old covenant with the blood sprinkled by Moses upon the Israelites, there was the blood of the Paschal lamb which was to be "struck" (Exod. xii. 7) "on the two side posts and on the upper door-post of the houses wherein they shall eat it." This was to be "a token" between them and the Lord, a token of the covenant of the Passover. This was the old covenant in the blood of the lamb. Then, in connection with the Passover supper, there sprung up the cus-

tom of drinking a cup of wine with blessing of God for His mercies to Israel, when He destroyed the firstborn of Egypt and spared Israel, and delivered them out of the house of bondage.

Thus, without insisting on a reference by Jesus to the shedding of blood and pouring out libations of wine, which so generally accompanied the ratifying of ancient heathen truces and covenants, we find the Jews of our Saviour's day familiar with the idea of their covenant of deliverance from Egypt, with the idea of the blood of the Paschal lamb particularly connected with that ancient deliverance, and with the idea of a cup of wine taken in thankful blessing of Jehovah, as they remembered that Paschal deliverance and the entire covenant of which it formed an important part.

It only needs to remember how the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes the prophet Jeremiah (Heb. viii. 8–12, Jer. xxxi. 31 etc.) as foretelling the time when Jehovah would make "a new covenant" with His people; and we have all the ideas, ready, familiar, and sacred, in the minds of our Lord's countrymen and contemporaries, only requiring to be welded together and stamped by Him into the form—"This cup," analogous to your cup of blessing in the Passover, "is the new covenant," fulfilling the anticipations of Jeremiah and the prophets, "in My blood" which, much more than the blood of bulls and of goats, shall (Heb. ix. 15) "purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God."

Thus naturally and distinctly does the form of administration of the wine, as recorded by St. Luke and St. Paul, yield a definite and intelligible signification in harmony alike with the writings of the Old Testament, the

usages of the Passover, and the ideas which were current among the Christian Hebrews of the apostolic age.

This cup of blessing is the token and remembrance of the new covenant which is sealed and ratified between you and God by no less than the shedding of My blood for you. Here are words entirely free and distinct from any vestige of the idea of an objective change in the fruit of the vine; and with these words must be reconciled the others recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark.

If our Saviour and the apostles meant to be understood as teaching the enormous doctrine that, in the Supper, wine was objectively and miraculously changed, in any way of transubstantiation, consubstantiation, or insubstantiation, into the blood of the Saviour, it is inconceivable that two out of the four historians of that miracle, which contravened the senses of those who looked on Jesus bodily present, apart from the wine, should have failed to mark pointedly the sole ground for believing in so stupendous a change; it is inconceivable that if Jesus said, "This is My blood," and was understood to mean, This wine is objectively changed, and has become materially or objectively My blood, the recorders of such words of transformation should have altered them and toned them down into so beautiful and natural and non-miraculous an utterance as "This cup is the new covenant in My blood."

The historians, being (by the hypothesis of transubstantiation) in duty bound and intending to record the most astounding miracle which rested on no evidence but the words, "This is My blood"—nay, which was and is controverted by every testimony of sense and common sense and faith, except those words—would never have substituted for those all-important words a phrase like

"This cup is the new covenant in My blood," which must be susceptible of a meaning, and, in the natural acting of men's minds, must be understood to bear a meaning, entirely different and distinct from any objective and material change in the wine.

But now, accepting these words of St. Luke and St. Paul as having been, thus necessarily, the fuller and more precise utterance and the more exact meaning of our Lord; bearing in mind what we have already noticed of the sketchy and fragmentary nature of the New Testament records; understanding that the New Testament writers, at the time when they represented Christ as saying, "This cup is," not My blood, but "the new covenant in My blood," could have entertained no idea of a miraculous and objective change by which the wine became blood in the cup:—bearing all this in mind, how easy is it to conceive that, in "the simplicity of the Gospel," St. Matthew and St. Mark, having no dream of insubstantiation or any other metaphysical or physical change in the material wine, did, in their obviously fragmentary and summary style of composition, write, "This is My blood of the covenant, which is being shed for many."

So inconceivable a notion as transubstantiation, in any of its modifications, being out of their ken, so incredible and demonstrably false an idea not entering into the apostolic mind (as we have seen is shown by the variations in St. Luke and St. Paul), it is quite conceivable that they wrote, "This is my blood of the covenant," instead of "This cup is the new covenant in My blood." To St. Matthew and St. Mark, who presently, *after* the participation in the cup of blessing, describe our Saviour as designating the contents of that cup as "the fruit of the vine," "this fruit of the vine," there was no danger imaginable

in speaking of that unchanged fruit of the vine as Christ's blood of the covenant, as a cup of wine which was henceforth forever to be associated in men's minds with Christ's new covenant between God and man, and with the blood of Christ by which that new covenant had been ratified and confirmed.

Thus, on the supposition that Jesus or the New Testament writers believed and intended to teach that there was an objective change in the wine of the Supper, the words of St. Paul and St. Luke, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," become a perilous and inconceivable deviation from Christ's words of administration; whereas, on the contrary, if we recognize the fact that no change of substance was known or thought of by our Saviour or by the writers of the New Testament, in that wine which St. Matthew and St. Mark declare to have been the fruit of the vine after the Saviour's blessing, just as it was before His giving of thanks, then the substitution of "This is My blood of the covenant," for "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," becomes an unimportant and harmless variation of the words.

Between the phrase, This cup is a token and remembrance of God's new covenant with you established in the shedding of My blood, and the phrase, This fruit of the vine is a token and remembrance of My blood, in the shedding of which is established God's new covenant with men, there is no difference of meaning; but between the sentence, This cup is the new covenant in My blood, and the sentence, This fruit of the vine, which continues to be the fruit of the vine, is, nevertheless, objectively changed into My blood—between these sentences there is all the difference which separates self-contradic-

tion and unmeaningness from an utterance of divine simplicity and wisdom.

Looking thus closely at the four records of our Lord's administration of the cup, we are constrained to believe that the words of St. Paul and St. Luke must necessarily be taken as defining the signification of the parallel expression in the two first Gospels; and, moreover, the idea of there being any objective change in the wine of the Last Supper appears to be no less utterly precluded by the cup being called the new covenant in Christ's blood by the Apostle and the third Evangelist, than by its contents being designated by St. Matthew and St. Mark, after the Supper, as still the fruit of the vine. So necessarily absent from our Saviour's words, in administering the cup, is all idea of objective change in the wine.

(xi.) *From this is to be Inferred the Form, or Meaning, in Administering the Bread.*

And this truth, so established, throws its light upon the four different and obviously fragmentary records of the words spoken by our Master in distributing the bread at His Last Supper. As Jesus said, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," so it becomes in the highest degree probable that He said likewise, "This bread is the new covenant in My body, which is being given for you." Just as, in your Jewish Passover, you took unleavened bread and ate of it, with thankful remembrance of Jehovah's covenant with Abraham and with Moses, and of His delivering you out of Egyptian slavery, and of His bestowing upon you all the good gifts of His providential bounty, so, in future, break bread, distribute it, and eat it in thankful remembrance, not only of all else which your Heavenly Father bestows upon you for the

body and for the mind, but also, and especially, in thankful remembrance of Me, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world—of Me, who am giving My body to be broken and sacrificed as the propitiation for your sins, and not for yours only, but "for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2).

(xii.) *Remembrance, not Sight, aimed at.*

"This do," as say St. Luke and St. Paul, "for My remembrance." To recall Me and My sacrifice of Myself to your minds; thus to show, declare, or preach (καταγγέλλειν) My death until I come again (1 Cor. xi. 26); do this in remembrance of Me. Do what? Change bread into My body? That, if it were objectively done, should produce, not a remembrance, but a vision of the Saviour. But there is no material and objective vision of Jesus even alleged by any one, and therefore the necessary inference is that there is no such objective change. If the bread be associated, subjectively or in the mind of the recipient, with memories and thoughts of Christ's body given for us, then may the doing this be said to be, not for a vision, but for a remembrance of the Lord. Thus, from the terms appended by two of our historians to the administration of the bread, it appears that they believed in no transformation of the bread, either physical or metaphysical, but simply and solely in its serving for a token which should recall the memory of Christ's sacrifice, and thus, reminding us of the benefits resulting from that sacrifice, should itself become a special channel and means of grace. "This do," they wrote, not for a vision of Me, but "for a remembrance of Me."

(xiii.) *Test the Hypothesis of Objective Change.*

This subjective realization of Christ's spiritual presence in the receiving of the bread, tallies with what we have learnt in examining the records of the administration of the cup. But suppose, on the other hand, that Christ and His disciples had understood and taught that, in the Supper, the bread was metamorphosed into the flesh of Christ objectively; then it would follow, in all probability and consistency, that they must have understood and taught that the wine was similarly metamorphosed into the blood of Christ; and then comes the inconceivable want of judgment and lack of accuracy into which St. Paul and St. Luke must have been betrayed when, believing, by this hypothesis, the bread was become flesh and the wine was become blood, they nevertheless deviated into a needless variation of the Lord's words, and represented Him as saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood."

As it is impossible to reconcile these words of St. Luke and St. Paul with apostolic belief in any objective change in the elements, so it is most natural to understand them in their plain grammatical signification; and then the other texts, relative to the administration of the bread and the wine, are seen to be variations and abbreviations of what our Saviour said, and so the shorter or less definite forms will have their meaning fixed and illustrated by those sacred utterances which, being preserved to us in greater fullness, are recognized as at once more precise, more definite, more simple, and more spiritual.

(xiv.) *Conclusion.*

Thus, then, whether we look at the words of institution and administration by Christ Himself; or whether regard be had to the Master's frequent employment of the

metaphors which tell of hungering and thirsting after righteousness, of eating the bread from heaven, and even of spiritually eating His flesh and drinking His blood; or whether we contemplate the scriptural and general usage of similar metaphors in the Old Testament and in all languages, the result is the same. There is no semblance of a belief in any kind of transubstantiation, or in any form of objective presence of Christ in the sacramental bread and wine; but, on the contrary, there is distinctest warning that that which is profitable, particularly in this part of our Christian religion, is not material, fleshly, objective, but is spiritual and subjective.

Such are the results of our investigation of the Saviour's institution of the Lord's Supper. We shall next attempt a study of apostolic usage and belief in connection with that sacred rite.

CHAPTER II.

THE APOSTOLIC USES OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

§ 1. *The Days between Christ's Resurrection and Ascension.*

Having, in the previous part of this book, examined the origin and institution of the Lord's Supper, we now proceed to observe the records of its usage in the apostolic histories. And, in this connection, it may be worth while to consider an event which took place in the transition period between the resurrection and the ascension, in the course of those forty days while yet the disciples had frequent intercourse, by sight and touch, with the glorified and spiritual body of the Saviour.

In those days, however changed His external appearance might be, though Mary could mistake His semblance for that of the gardener (John xx. 15); though one of the ancient records explains (Mark xvi. 12) that his appearance was "in another form,"[1] in a *different* form: yet there was something in the tone and expression of His voice by which He was unmistakably recognizable. The glory of His different form might fail to strike the Magdalene. She was absorbed in thoughts of her blessed but lost Redeemer. For any other human form than His she had no eye, no thought. Resplendent that form might be with heavenly sheen: the movement full of divine vigor: the eye beaming with grace and truth; the whole being replete with the gentleness, and power, and spirit of the

[1] ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ.

Lord of glory: but such a form was not like that of the scourged and crucified carpenter, not like that of the exhausted bearer of other men's sins, not like that of the inanimate corpse which she and death had both embraced and, as it were, contended to retain.

The beneficent victim of the cross was in her mind's eye, and she could not identify Him with the spiritual and glorified body that still bore, indeed, the prints of the nails and the wound of the spear, but was passing to the Father, and receiving the crown of heaven's King, instead of the crown of thorns.

For this "form," so identical and yet so changed, Mary had no eye. He was different from her Saviour on the cross and in the grave. He might be the gardener. Could He tell her where lay the lacerated but beloved remains of Him who had given her deliverance from the seven demons? Then He spoke her name. At the sound of that name, breathed so familiarly, so tenderly, in the very tone and with the very spirit that freed her from the evil bondage, she turned from the sepulchre to the living man, and in His changed form she saw her Master, and fell at His feet with the adoring cry, "Rabboni."

To Mary Magdalene it was thus His words that were spirit and were life, and they revealed to her once more the Saviour, Jesus.

§ 2. (*a.*) *The Journey to Emmaus and the Meal there.*

But this appearance to the Magdalene was not the only marvel of that first Lord's Day. Two of the disciples were walking to Emmaus, and as they talked with sadness of Jesus and His being lost to them, the risen Lord came and walked with them. His words, as He talked with them and opened to them the Scriptures from Moses and

all the prophets, made their hearts to burn within them (Luke xxiv. 32), but still they failed to recognize their Lord. Their own pre-conceptions and prejudices as to how He should "redeem Israel" with pomp and with the sword, and with a kingdom of this world, held their eyes, so that even in the changed and spiritual body of Him who had been crucified, but now was glorified, they failed to recognize Jesus, the King of righteousness, the King of peace. Arrived, however, at the village whither they went, they constrained their unknown companion to tarry with them, as the day was far spent, and it was towards evening. "And it came to pass (Luke xxiv. 30), as He sat at meat with them, He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to them."

As the sound of her name upon the lips of Jesus recalled Mary to her right mind and led her to turn from the grave and her own sad imaginings, and to behold and recognize her Master in His changed form, so this act of Jesus, and these words of blessing in this evening meal at Emmaus, opened the eyes of Cleopas and his fellow-disciple; and "they knew Him" (Luke xxiv. 31); "and He vanished out of their sight."

Of course we cannot say positively, in the silence of the Gospel narratives on the subject, that the apostles had already communicated to the disciples who were with them in Jerusalem the manner in which Jesus had instituted the breaking of bread and the drinking of wine to be done in remembrance of Him as oft as they should drink. We cannot be sure that already, in the few hours that had intervened between the Friday of crucifixion and the Sunday of resurrection, Cleopas and his companion had learned from the apostles that, in obedience to one of the latest of the Lord's loving precepts, they were

never to refresh their bodies with bread and wine without also refreshing their souls by that eating of Christ's flesh which consists in coming to Him, and that drinking of Christ's blood (John vi. 35) which consists in self-abandoning trust in Him. This we cannot say positively; but nothing seems more natural or more likely than that, in those hours of bereavement and dismay and agony, every memory of the beloved Jesus should be sought for and repeated amongst the apostles and the women and the others who were with them. Each would tell the other what he had learnt of the Master's last sayings and doings; and it is hard to imagine that any of the disciples then in Jerusalem, the little flock who must have been drawn nearer than ever to one another by the loss of their Good Shepherd, failed to be informed of that Last Supper and of the especial and abiding rite and memorial that had there been instituted.

Not certain, but highly probable, does it thus appear that the two from Emmaus made a conscious reference to the Last Supper and its memorial rite when, on their return to Jerusalem, they "told" (Luke xxiv. 35) "what things were done in the way, and how Jesus was known of them in the breaking of bread."[1] Notwithstanding that these two from Emmaus are said, on their return to Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 33), to have found "the eleven" gathered together with the rest of the disciples, yet this phrase, "the eleven," may be, like "the twelve" in 1 Cor. xv. 5, and in Matthew xix. 28, a mere official designation of the apostles generally, without precise reference to their then exact number. And, if this may be so, it leaves open for consideration the opinion of those scholars who have identified the "Cleopas" of Luke xxiv. 18,

[1] ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου.

with the "Alphæus" of Matt. x. 3—each being a Greek equivalent for one and the same Jewish name, Khalphai —and then, as this Alphæus was the father of an apostle James, the surmise is not wholly without warrant, that the companion of Cleopas, on the way to Emmaus, was his son James; and this, these same scholars say, is, in all likelihood, the occasion referred to by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7) in the words, "After that, He was seen of James."

This chain of scholarlike surmises appears to us far from being deficient in verisimilitude; and, if it be true, it will readily account for the Saviour's words of blessing in "the breaking of bread" being familiar to the disciples at Emmaus, and serving as the suggestive association of thought which recalled them from Jesus in His death to Jesus once more alive, in His changed form and risen body.

Whether James the Less was at Emmaus or not; whether or not the two disciples in that breaking of bread had called up before their minds a vivid recollection of words they had, within the last few hours, heard from apostolic lips as amongst the most precious relics of their crucified Master; whether with or without any such direct and fresh association of memory with the Last Supper, at any rate, here, at Emmaus, was an instance of our Saviour using His words of blessing at an ordinary evening meal in a private house, with only two disciples present, as an occasion and instrument for making the scales of ignorance and prejudice to fall from His followers' eyes; an occasion and instrument for enabling them to know and recognize Him as their Master and their Lord.

Whether or not it was a conscious repetition, on the disciples' part, of the scene in that guest-chamber before

the Paschal feast, this is clear—it was an exemplification of the Lord revealing Himself, at a domestic meal, to the minds and hearts of some disciples, just as to other disciples He made Himself known by the name "Mary," or by the "Reach hither thy finger and behold My hands" (John xx. 27), or by the "Peace be unto you" of another occasion (John xx. 19), or by the eating "a piece of broiled fish" (Luke xxiv. 42), or by the "Cast the net on the right side of the ship and ye shall find" (John xxi. 6), or by the thunder and the lightning and the "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" (Acts ix. 4) of yet another occasion.

Many are the ways in which He comes and seeks to save us by constraining us to know and love Him; and this opening the eyes at an ordinary meal, partaken with only two friends, or this celebration of the Supper with a Church (an *ecclesia*, an assembling of only two), is just one among the many and various methods by which our Lord manifests Himself to us and to all who will receive Him.

But now let us look at the instructions, bearing on our present inquiry, which arise out of this incident at Emmaus.

Whether it be regarded as an ordinary domestic meal, or as a Church ordinance, or as both, what follows? This, assuredly: that in a house or Church of Christ's own choosing there was an evening celebration, just as the Lord's first institution had been at an evening meal; there was no altar but a table; there were no vestments but the ordinary costume of the disciples and their Master; there was no trace of an eastward position, nor any sign of the Saviour and the disciples looking in one direction, but, on the contrary, the English rendering, "As

they sat at meat with Him," has for its equivalent in the Greek[1] (Luke xxiv. 30), "As He *reclined* with them," in obvious allusion to the then prevailing custom of not sitting, as is the modern practice, but reclining on couches round the table—Jesus, the president in this domestic meal or Church ordinance, on one couch, the two disciples on other couches on either side of Him.

The direction of their three faces would thus be towards three different quarters of the heaven, except in so far as, at any moment, they turned themselves away from the natural attitude as they reclined to look at some momentary attraction; and we can well image to ourselves how, as the Master spoke the words of blessing, their attention would be roused and riveted. They would gaze, not all three towards Emmaus, as on their journey, but now the two, with rapt attention, on His face, on His features, familiar though transformed. And thus, when they looked steadily on His glorious countenance, the recognition would grow upon them, as it had done in the case of Mary Magdalene when she fixed her attention on Him who called her by the familiar appellation, "Mary." So was Jesus known of them in the breaking of bread.

Upon the Master and His disciples being thus brought face to face and eye to eye, the recognition followed; and so far as this precedent is applicable to the uses of a modern Church assembly, it would seem to favor the practice of the clergyman officiating with his face towards the congregation.

It may be urged, however, that the salient point at Emmaus was that both the disciples looked towards their divine Lord in this breaking of bread; and that, simi-

[1] ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν.

larly, in our Church assemblies, all the disciples, alike those who minister and those who are ministered to, should look in one direction, towards their Saviour. Let this be granted, and what then? Christ the Lord is in heaven, at God's right hand. And though some may urge that heaven is (in spite of the antipodes) above, beyond the clouds, in the circumambient ether, always "above," always "on high"; and though others may urge that heaven is no locality at all—without entering into that dispute, it is, we hold, impossible, unless we go back upon the remnants of some antique worship of the sun, to show any substantial reason why all men, all over the world, should look for our blessed Lord in the east, rather than in the west, or south, or north. By all means, let us look towards Christ with mind and heart, and in whatever way we can. But let us not deceive ourselves with the idea that He is exclusively in Jerusalem, or on Mount Gerizim, or in any quarter of the horizon.

(*b.*) *An "Objective" Presence at Emmaus, and its Bearing on Our Inquiry.*

One other point is brought before us by the scene at Emmaus, and that is, the bodily and objective presence of our Saviour in that breaking of bread.

True, whether the repast at Emmaus is regarded as a domestic meal or as a Church ordinance, or whether, as seems to us the more obvious the more fully we study the entire scene, it be a happy blending of Church communion with ordinary family life—on either hypothesis there was, on the occasion of that breaking of bread, an unquestionable *objective* presence of the Lord. But then observe, that objective presence of Christ was manifest

to the sight of the disciples, was ascertained by their sense of hearing as they listened to His words; and though, for once, He checked the touch of Mary when (John xx. 17), in her amazement and delight, she was too prone to cling still to His bodily presence, yet at Emmaus, as subsequently in dealing with Thomas at Jerusalem, there is no room for doubt that our Saviour was palpable to the touch of His disciples.

This is legitimate evidence of objective or corporeal presence. Here is bread present and broken, and given and received in its objectivity, palpable to the touch, familiar to the taste, obvious to the eye, distinct upon the table from all other objects that lie around—distinct and different as the inanimate from the animate, the merely material from the divine—so distinct and so different is that bread that was broken at Emmaus from the blessed Jesus who broke it, and who was there palpably, audibly, visibly present in His corporeal and objective reality.

Let those who tell us Christ is *objectively* present with the bread on their Communion Tables give to us the same proofs of objective presence as were manifested to the disciples on that occasion, and they will convince all sane persons that the Lord is corporeally present, and is also corporeally and objectively separate and distinct from the bread which is broken.

In that breaking of bread with the two disciples, Christ was indeed objectively present, but He was there, not by transubstantiation or insubstantiation with the bread, but by juxtaposition.

In quitting the consideration of this interesting episode, we would only further draw attention to the fact that Christ's objective presence with the disciples began, not in the breaking of bread, but in the course of their

walk, and while (Luke xxiv. 14, 15) they talked and reasoned together of all those things which had happened to their Master in Jerusalem. If, in the more steady and prolonged gaze as they reclined with Jesus on their couches, His features, even through their new glory, were recognized and became again known by Cleopas and his companion, it was on the road, while their tongues and thoughts were busy with the things of Jesus, that He came and joined them. And when, after the meal, He had (Luke xxiv. 31) vanished out of their sight, the chief impression left upon their thoughts finds utterance in the words, "Did not our heart burn within us, *while He talked with us by the way, and while He opened to us the Scriptures?*"

Truly the history connected with Emmaus makes for a distinguishing between the body of Christ and the broken bread; and it attaches more importance to the burning words of Christ than to any rite, however holy, or any participation of bread, even though it be blessed by His distinct bodily presence.

§ 3. (*a.*) "*Breaking Bread*" *at Jerusalem.*

But we must now proceed to the next point in the history of the apostles' usage in celebrating the Lord's Supper. The days of transition between the resurrection and the ascension are past. The Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Spirit has been witnessed. St. Peter has given his explanation of that wondrous event. As a skillful fisher of men, he has drawn into the Gospel net "about three thousand souls" (Acts ii. 41); and, moreover (Acts ii. 47), it was a period of joy and prosperity with the infant Church. Not only did the Lord add to the Church, the assembly or *ecclesia*, day by day, them that

were in the way of salvation, not only was the Church occupied in praising God, but, for a longer or a shorter time, the believers even had favor with all the people. The horrid cries, "Crucify him! crucify him!" were past. The persecution of Peter and John and the murder of Stephen were not yet. In the meanwhile there were halcyon days, such as, but for the sins and follies of believers, and but for the outbreaks of unbelieving madness, should oftener prevail. The Church was serving God in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and accordingly (Rom. xiv. 18) she was not only acceptable to God, but was also "approved of men."

It is of these peaceful days that we are presented with a picture in the closing verses of the second chapter of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. With most of the points in that picture we are at present only so far concerned as they help to give distinctness and color to one particular part of that early and apostolic life. What a picture it is, however! The first feature delineated by the historian is that those growing thousands of the primitive Church "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine,"[1] in the teaching, that is, of the apostles —not only in the acceptance of some one or other peculiar dogma of the apostles, but in the general instruction of those men who had been most intimately associated with the Saviour, and were now His chief pastors and representatives.

The time might come when some of these very apostles, pre-eminently St. Peter (Gal. ii. 11, etc.) would depart from the simplicity of the Gospel, and require to be "withstood to the face" by those who, like St. Paul, had also seen the Lord and were jealous for the truth that

[1] τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων.

was in Jesus, and for the freedom wherewith Christ had made men free. But that time was not yet arrived. At present Peter and his colleagues were fresh from companionship with the Blessed One. The Holy Spirit was bringing all things to their remembrance. Many a saying of the Lord, that passed unnoticed when He spoke it, was making itself to be perceived in the strange treasury of recollection. Misunderstood when first heard amid Jewish expectations of temporal pomp and power, many a spiritual promise and hope and aspiration now showed itself to the apostles' minds in fresh glory and impressiveness.

Was it not through suffering and toil, through watchfulness and anxiety, that Noah, and Abraham, and Joseph, and Moses, and Joshua had served God and ministered to man? Was it not through peril and persecution, not seldom through death itself, that Samuel, and Elijah, and Elisha, and David, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Daniel, and the other servants of God had wrought righteousness, and out of weakness had been made strong? If it had been so with these typical men, must not their divine antitype, in like manner and still more, be perfected through suffering? Was not this foreshadowed in every rite and sacrifice of the Mosaic system? Was not this plainly portrayed as awaiting the great Servant of God, the Man of Sorrows (Isaiah liii. 3), who bore our griefs, and with whose stripes we are healed?

Burning words on these topics Jesus had spoken after His resurrection, and before it (Matt. xx. 18, 19); and these heart-pricking words were being brought freshly back to the apostles' memories. Here was teaching about the woes and agonies of the Lamb of God, about His taking away the sin of the world, about His precious

blood-shedding, about our need to be washed in that blood, to enter into those sufferings, if we would have a share in His glory. Here was teaching with which the apostles were being filled by the Holy Spirit, and with which they were replenishing the minds of the believers. Here was the first noticeable characteristic of the primitive Church, continuing steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, laying strong and persistent hold of the apostles' teaching.

The second point in this historical picture is that the first Christians adhered with similar persistency to that fellowship or communion[1] which Jesus and His apostles taught and exemplified. No Christian suffered without his fellow-Christians suffering with him; no Christian rejoiced without the brethren rejoicing with him. Nor was it the sympathy of the heart alone; nor was it with words of kindness only, however sweet those words, that this sympathy, this fellowship, or communion was shown. Christ's communion had consisted in His giving and suffering all that could be given and suffered for man; and His disciples' communion was of a like sort. It is true, to any who would not work, it said (2 Thess. iii. 10), Neither shall he eat; but, amongst those who were willing to work, its practice was to distribute to all, *as every man had need*. No man (Acts iv. 32) said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common; and, so far as it was requisite and as the owners chose (Acts v. 4), they sold their possessions and goods (Acts ii. 45), and parted them to all men, *as every man had need*. Such and so thorough was the communion of saints, or of believers, in the spring-time of apostolic days.

[1] κοινωνία.

The next prominent point in the historic delineation is that the first Christians adhered with the same persistency to "the breaking of bread" as they did to the communion or fellowship, and to the teaching or instruction of the apostles. This point, as it recurs presently in the history with additional features, and as it touches the chief interest of this our inquiry, we pass by for the moment.

The fourth trait in the picture of apostolic Christianity is the steadfast continuance in "the prayers," alike of the assembly, where a few families or individuals might be gathered together, and of the closet (Matt. vi. 6), where the believer prayed in secret to his Father, and of the Temple, where it appears (Acts ii. 46) they were still wont to join in some portions of the Judaic service; unless, indeed, this resort to the Temple was for Christian prayer in some of the precincts or courts of that great edifice. However that may be, these Jewish disciples of our Saviour "continued daily with one accord in the Temple," and that is made a special feature in the picture of their early history. It was far from being offensive to their Jewish fellow-citizens. It must, therefore, have commended itself to the unbelieving Jews as a reverent and religious employment of the Temple. It marks a willingness in the first disciples to worship with those who were far from being in entire harmony of religious thought with them. It shows that even from the unbelieving Jews Christ's first followers were far from hastening to rend and sever themselves.

This abstinence from the schismatic temper and practice is quite noticeable in the primitive Church, and beautifully does it combine with their persistence in all Christian devotion and prayers to show us their piety.

"In everything," doubtless, as afterwards taught the great apostle of the Gentiles, "by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving," they made known their requests unto God (Phil. iv. 6); and this, again, was a marked feature in their Church. They persistently adhered to all opportunities for prayer. They daily frequented the courts of the Temple.

Yet another characteristic marked that early Church. "Many wonders and signs" (Acts ii. 43) "were done by the apostles;" and such was the effect of these deeds, that admiration, reverence, even "fear, came upon every soul." Whether this fear was chiefly among the believers or the unbelievers, we are not told at this point: but, doubtless, its general course would be, to begin with the awakening of attention, even among unbelievers, to the great power of Christ, and then to melt, among believers, into love and trust as more was known of the divine goodness and mercy. This fear, this reverential awe, was a conspicuous feature in that age of the Church's history.

And now the course of St. Luke's description brings us back once more to that which he had before enumerated as the third characteristic of the primitive Christians. After mentioning the daily resort to the Temple, the historian adds that they also, in all appearance *daily* too, broke bread at home,[1] "from house to house," and "did eat[2] [partook or ate *together*] their meat[3] [food] with gladness and singleness of heart."

It will, we think, be perfectly clear to the reader that this "breaking of bread," which is twice insisted upon by St. Luke in his delineation of apostolic religion, must have had some special importance attached to it. Unless

[1] κατ' οἶκον. [2] μετελάμβανον. [3] τροφῆς.

it constituted a distinctive part of that religion, the "breaking of bread" would scarcely be twice emphatically mentioned in connection with the apostolic instruction, the fellowship, the prayers, the reverential awe, the miracles, the daily gatherings in the Temple, the praise of God, and the popular esteem of the first believers. Obviously, this "breaking of bread" was part, and no unimportant part, of apostolic religion.

And if we look back over a period of some five or six weeks only in the history of that early Church and its Saviour, it will not be hard to find the meaning of this mention of the breaking of bread in the midst of the solemn and characteristic acts of the first believers.

We have already seen how likely it was that the two disciples, on their return to Jerusalem from Emmaus, made conscious reference to the then recent institution of the Lord's Supper, when they narrated to the apostles what things were done in the way (Luke xxiv. 35), and how Jesus was known of them *in the breaking of bread*. But, morally certain as we regard the reference to the Lord's Supper in these words of Cleopas and his companion, it is surely beyond all question that, even if the disciples had not been acquainted with the institution of the Lord's Supper up to the time of their making that announcement to the apostles, that very announcement, connecting their recognition of Christ with the breaking of bread, must have called forth from the apostles an explanation of their Master's command, "This do, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance;" and this explanation and this injunction would naturally and necessarily be spread at once among the hundred and twenty of Acts i. 15, and among the three thousand of Acts ii. 41, as well as among the other new converts of

Acts ii. 47. So obviously is this "breaking of bread," mentioned by St. Luke as one of the religious characteristics of the infant Church, to be identified with that commemorative breaking of bread and drinking of wine, whose institution by the Saviour has been our study in the preceding pages.

If, indeed, the certainty of this identification needed or admitted further confirmation, it might be made doubly sure by the manner in which, as we shall in due course be led to observe, the phrase "to break bread" had become, for the writer of the Acts and for the Apostle Paul, an accustomed designation for the communion of the Lord's Supper. We almost owe an apology to the reader for any elaboration of the proof of this identity, but its importance will, it is hoped, hold us excused. And now we proceed to notice the lessons concerning the Lord's Supper derivable from this mention of it in St. Luke's history of the apostles.

The first point that strikes one in this connection is the manner in which the believers' breaking of bread *at home*, or *from house to house*, is contrasted with their resorting to the Temple, and at the same time is associated with their partaking, together with it, of their other food or nourishment. In the Temple, for whatever purpose the Christians went there, they might be assembled in their hundreds or in their thousands "with one accord"[1] (Acts ii. 46); but, in any one of their homes, there is nothing to make it probable that more than a few scores at the most, out of the three thousand and upwards, could meet together for such an act as the breaking of bread.

It is true, indeed, that, in some sense, we are told (ver. 44) that "all that believed were *together*,[2] and had

[1] ὁμοθυμαδόν. [2] ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.

all things common;" and this statement is made just after "three thousand souls" have been named as the number of those already added to the Church in Jerusalem. Some interpreters regard the phrase "together" as signifying cordial and affectionate agreement amongst the believers, and not as implying residence or assembly in one place. Other interpreters, pressed by the difficulty of such a multitude being "continually assembled together," minimize it by explaining that, the feast being over, a large portion of the three thousand would by this time have returned to their homes, away from Jerusalem!

Whether the phrase "together" is to be understood of locality or of agreement, it is quite clear that though in the court of a house, or in the street adjacent, three thousand people might assemble to listen to an apostle's discourse, such a vast assembly could not be "continually together," and still less was likely to be accommodated and supplied with bread and wine daily in any one private house in Jerusalem. Yet this primitive "breaking of bread" was conducted in their houses, *at home*. Did two or three families meet daily in one house? And was another private house the meeting-place for several other families? And, so, in a hundred or a hundred and fifty private houses, was the daily "breaking of bread" among the three thousand carried on? Shall we say that only one-third of the whole number were adults, and came to the breaking of bread? There is no ground for such an assertion as a fact; but if, for the argument's sake, it were supposed, there would still be a thousand to "break bread" in, probably, not less than forty homes.

At a later period of the history (Acts xx. 7), it appears that the believers at Troas were wont to meet for the breaking of bread on the "first day of the week." Possi-

bly, they did not also come together for that purpose at Troas, at the date of St Paul's visit, on the other six days of the week. Shall we suppose that lesser family breakings of bread took place *daily*, but that the gathering themselves together for all the believers in Troas, or for several families in Jerusalem, to break bread in common, was a *weekly* custom? That may be so. But it is impossible to believe that, in any private room belonging to the first Christians in Jerusalem, there were daily or or even weekly assemblies of the whole three thousand, or even of the one thousand who *may* have been the entire number of the adults.

Thus, then, by the contrast between the use of the Temple for some purposes and the employment of their private houses for the "breaking of bread"—by these considerations, coupled with all the probabilities that can lead us to a judgment concerning the accommodation likely to be provided by the homes of the first disciples in Jerusalem, we are led to infer that the daily breaking of bread, mentioned in Acts ii. 42, 46, must have been conducted in numerous private houses, and in such manners and ways as would not unduly engage the time, or interfere with the industrial occupations, of a body of believers who, for the most part, belonged to the poorer sections of the community. Does it not thus appear most probable that if, on each first day of the week, each resurrection day, there may already have been *weekly* groupings of several families to "break bread," the *daily* practice most likely was for each family to "break bread" at its own house? This probability is greatly enhanced when we consider that the "breaking of bread," as a religious ordinance, was closely connected with partaking of their other food together with it.[1] They partook of food, liter-

[1] μετελάμβανον τροφῆς.

ally *nourishment*, the ordinary meal, together with the broken bread.

Nothing, we take it, can be clearer than the connection, in this history, of the Lord's Supper, the breaking of bread, with the ordinary meals of the first believers in their homes. Such meals and such Lord's Suppers may have been partaken daily by several families in common; but, we confess, to us it seems much more probable they were the practice of each family, ordinarily, by itself in private, however occasionally the family circle may have been enlarged by the presence and participation of friendly individuals or families.

(*b.*) *An Appeal to "Antiquity."*

One thing is indubitable—this combination of the Lord's Supper with a domestic meal (known afterwards as the *agape*, or love-feast) could have been no vast aggregate assembling of the three thousand and upwards. Whether consisting of one or more families, each of these parties was gathered at a house, in private, in close resemblance to the original institution by Christ, and only in more remote analogy with the Lord's Supper, without an ordinary meal, as practised in the public Christian buildings of later ages. "As they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to the disciples" (Matt. xxvi. 26). This was the breaking of bread, then, combined with the feast of that sacred party: and just in the same manner did the early Christians, as we have seen, combine the common meal with the breaking of bread in remembrance of the Lord.

The quietness, the absence of pomp and ritual, of form and ceremony, in this apostolic usage, can hardly fail to strike attentive and thoughtful students of the best and

purest Christian antiquity, at a time when, as in the present day, there is a vigorous attempt on foot to add so much of pomp, and rite, and ornament to the decorous comeliness of the Reformed Church in England; and this teaching of the earliest Christian antiquity, speaking through the pages of the New Testament, should be all the more striking and impressive, inasmuch as the modern upholders of postures, and vestments, and genuflexions appeal to *antiquity* for the justifying of their strange practices. Antiquity! To what antiquity should the appeal be made? To that of the Middle Ages, and to that of post-apostolic times? or to the very actions and customs of the apostles and of the Lord Himself? This is a case, we take it, in which, to any mind of moderate wisdom and piety, the question asked involves the certain answer. Better, surely, to follow the precedent and example of Christ Himself, and of His apostles, than that of any subsequent teacher.

(*c.*) *The "Gladness," etc., of the Early Christian "Breaking of Bread."*

Before we quit this part of our subject, it is most necessary to observe the frame of mind in which these primitive Christians, just illumined by the Holy Spirit, fresh from intercourse with our Saviour, undisturbed for the time by persecution and difficulties, partook of the broken bread and of their other food with it.

Instead of any feeling of terror, instead of regarding the sacred Supper as a "terrible sacrifice," instead of approaching it with pallid lips, and half inanimate from fasting—instead of all this, perfect love had cast out the fear in which piety had its beginning (1 John iv. 18), and those earliest followers of the Lord partook of

the broken bread and of their other food "with gladness and singleness of heart" (Acts ii. 46).

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a word expressive of more exuberant joy than the Greek noun here translated "gladness."[1] Its English equivalent is given, in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, as "exceeding great joy." In St. Luke's Gospel (i. 14. 44), this same word is used to describe the delight of parents over the best and most blessed of children. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 9), it portrays the divine joy given to the Messiah, "the oil of *gladness* above" His fellows: and, once more (Jude 24), the same term describes the "exceeding joy" of the Redeemer in His people, when He presents them faultless before the presence of the Father's glory.

Surely, in this word which depicts the gladness, the joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. xiv. 17), the religious cheerfulness of genuine Christianity, there is something which should sweeten the sour looks of the sullen Puritan on the one hand, and correct the ascetic self-torture of the mediævalist on the other hand. Even at the board where he broke bread in memory of his Saviour, and as a sacred means of grace, the temper and appearance of the believer who had seen Christ, who lived nearest to Christ, were marked by the gladness of exceeding great joy.

Not far removed from this "gladness" was the other characteristic of the primitive believers, "singleness of heart." The "singleness" of this description[2] is a word derived from a piece of ground which is void of stones, smooth, without a roughness to obstruct him that runs. From this root-idea of the word when applied to *places*, it

[1] ἀγαλλίασις. [2] ἀφελότης, compounded of ἀ, *not*, and φελλεύς, *a stone*.

came to signify, when applied to *persons*, plain, simple, unsophisticated; and when applied to *language*, its meaning was simple, not intricate or involved. From these usages of the word and its kindred terms, it is not difficult to perceive what is its meaning in connection with the heart of man. Such "singleness of heart" implies that there was in these early Christians the sincerity that was void of anything which could make a brother to stumble and fall; the smoothness of genuine amiability that, without guile or hypocrisy, would fain make things easy and pleasant with its neighbors: the singleness and simplicity which, amidst many joys and many sorrows, many labors and many distractions, yet had its note of harmony, its bond of union and consistency in utter and absorbing devotion to the once crucified but now risen and ascended Lord.

Whatever forces might at any time be acting from without on these Christian hearts, you might count on this one thing, namely, that within them the loving, self-sacrificing, glorified Christ would be the prevailing force, the one control, the ruling inspiration. Truly, it was no wonder that such "singleness of heart," such absence of all double-mindedness and of all offensiveness, such concentration of thought and energy upon the things which were useful, kind, and of good report, should, through these few halcyon days, win for the first believers "favor with all the people."

And thus we have the picture, set before us in its completeness, of the first recorded apostolic celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Noteworthy are the omissions in this delineation, as compared with the administrations of some later times. Mark, here, in the apostolic age, in the quiet days of the

very Church of the apostles, there is no trace of an altar, no sign of a sacrificing priest, no note of peculiar vestment or posture or ceremony of any kind. Doubtless all things were, as they should be, done "decently and in order"; doubtless, too, with a wisely pliant adaptation to the varying circumstances, opportunities, and abilities of the different families or groups of families, who, "breaking bread from house to house" (or at home), "did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." There is no record, nor any room for a surmise, that an apostle was present at each of these numerous breakings of bread. The obvious inference, on the contrary, is that these meals, accompanied by a celebration of the Lord's Supper, were presided over, in the vast majority of cases, by the natural and therefore divinely appointed head of the house, its parent or elder—that is, in Greek, its *presbyter*.

Except the bread, there was only the wine in all cases implied in obedience to Christ's institution; and, besides this, there was the blessing or thanksgiving, Christianized, indeed, among believers, but otherwise common to Christians and all pious Jews. These sacred things, in their private homes, presided over, in the ordinary absence of apostles, by the natural heads of families, and all conjoined and associated with the family meal, but hallowed and refined by the memory of Christ and His sufferings and His triumph—these, as parts of a life whose atmosphere was apostolic teaching, and fellow-helpfulness, and prayers, and signs and wonders, and the loving, reverential fear of not being thorough and in earnest with God and with Christ—these, with Temple worship, and the habitual praising of God, and with a pervading temper of gladness and singleness of heart,—

these were the essentials of the Lord's Supper, so far as we have yet been able to learn them from the institution by Christ Himself, and from the history of the earliest administrations. The general life with Christ was all-important; "the trivial round, the common task," sufficed as the occasion to break bread: the sole essentials apparently required for the Lord's Supper were the believer's pious disposition and religious life, and the partaking, as memorials of Christ, bread and wine after blessing and thanksgiving by the head of the family.

§ 4. *St. Paul on the Lord's Supper.*

But from this general description of the pristine habit of "breaking bread," let us proceed to notice the more definite teaching of St. Paul on this important subject.

In this connection there are two passages, especially, to be studied; one in the tenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the other in the eleventh chapter of the same Epistle. The two passages, though so near to one another, yet spring out of quite different trains of thought and reasoning in the apostle's mind, and in his dealing with the religious life of his correspondents; and they may well be expected, therefore, to show us the mind of St. Paul in different and yet mutually illustrating views of the Lord's Supper. In the earlier passage, this holy feast of the Christian is regarded in juxtaposition with the banquets of the unbelieving and idolatrous heathen. In the latter passage, the Lord's Supper, quite apart from unbelievers and their practices, is regarded in two lights—its proper use, and the corruptions of that use which had already crept into the Corinthian Church.

(*a.*) 1 *Cor.* x. 16, 17, *etc.*

Let us examine the first passage, in which St. Paul mentions the Lord's Supper in contrast with idolatrous feasts.

In a mixed and busy population like that of Corinth, where heathen people, and Jews, and converts to Christ from both Judaism and heathenism, were all living near one another, and cultivating one another's society and intimacy for the purposes of that commercial buying and selling which brought them to the city of the two seas, east and west of the Mediterranean, and of the two lands, north and south of Greece, it will readily be understood how great would be the inclination in men's minds to break down all the barriers of caste, to make friends, for the widest possible spreading of *connection*, by obliterating the party walls of national custom or religious practice.

To the utmost limit of what conscience would permit, and the requirements of national caste would tolerate, the man of the east would in all things cultivate the exchange of intimacy and friendship with the man of the west, and he from the south with him who came from the north.

What Alexandria taught, in her eclectic wealth of speculation, would become intermingled with the stream of Grecian lore and Grecian elegance and subtlety. What the Gaul, or the Spaniard, or the colonist from Southern Italy, or from Sicily or Cyrene, was groping after and blundering over in the dark, was interchanged and became commingled with what the dark and superstitious traffickers from the Phœnician mother-land, or from Crete, or from the remnants of the old Carthagin-

ian stock, could offer as their contribution to this strange intellectual, moral, and religious compound.

Amidst the concessions and soft compliances of these multitudinous thinkers and worshippers, what should the Christians do? Stand stolidly aloof, keep themselves separate, would be the ready answer of the common herd of minds. But St. Paul, with true Christian insight, could see there was more involved in the question than showed itself to the shallow and the superficial. As those merchants desired intimacy in their concessions, with a view to commercial barter and pecuniary gain, so the apostle sought for the widest range of intimacy, even by becoming all things to all men, that he might save some and edify as many as possible.

The question "concerning the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols" (1 Cor. viii. 4) had been touched in the eighth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and it was then left with two lines of reflection on it: "We [Christians endowed with any strength of mind] know that an idol is nothing in the world"; it has no reality of the divine or spiritual about it; it is a *simulacrum* and a sham; "there is none other God but one." For us, therefore, so far as we ourselves are concerned, other men's inanities and dreams about an idol having power to contaminate sacrifices do not touch us. We may and can harmlessly thank God for food prepared in an idol's temple, and we may and can eat it with an undisturbed conscience.

So stands the case for ourselves; but when the possible effect of such action on the less strong-minded believer is contemplated, then love for Christ and for the souls He died to save leads us to pause and stand aloof from meat which, harmless to us, might raise scruples in

their minds, and, those scruples being roughly set aside in compliance with our example, their consciences would be blunted; they would learn to do those things of whose propriety they had doubts; and so "this liberty of" ours might "become a stumbling-block to them that are weak."

With these two reflections, and with the glorious resolve, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend," the question is left for a time. Then, after a while, the subject is resumed by St. Paul, in view of so many Israelites having been overthrown in the wilderness by unbelief and idolatry and other sins. These things were written, says the apostle, for our admonition. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." "Wherefore (1 Cor. x. 14, 15), my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say."

Look, reasons St. Paul, at this subject of participation in meat connected with idol-sacrifices in the light of our own breaking of bread. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion[1] of the blood of Christ?" Is it not a fellowship in the new covenant sealed by the blood of Christ?[2] "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" Is it not a fellowship and participation in the new covenant ratified by the body of Christ slain upon the cross? "For we, the many[3] [the multitude of believers], are one bread, one body: for the whole of us[4] partake of[5] [out of] the one bread." Here is the *rationale* of our communion or fellowship.

[1] κοινωνία, without the definite article.
[2] *Vide* 1 Cor. xi. 25, and pp. 47—58 of this essay.
[3] οἱ πολλοί. [4] οἱ γὰρ πάντες. [5] ἐκ.

Though we are a multitude of separate individuals, yet, by participation in that one bread of the covenant which symbolizes Him who is the bread of life, we become incorporated into a fellowship or communion one with another. There is a fellowship in the religious commemoration; there is a fellowship of believers among themselves; there is a fellowship of each and all with the Lord. The very aim and object of our Lord's Supper is this pervading idea of fellowship and incorporation of us with one another, and of all with Christ, by means of participation in the one bread. But, is St. Paul's line of thought, before I draw the legitimate conclusion from this view of the matter, "Behold Israel after the flesh": consider the case of the unbelieving Jews, who still practice the sacrifices of the Mosaic law (1 Cor. x. 18). "Are not they which eat the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" Do not those who eat the Jewish sacrifices enter, by the very act, into a fellowship and communion with the Jewish altar, and its worshippers, and its priests, and its God?

What am I saying then? asks the apostle. Am I forgetting that I before said idols were "nothing," and had no real connection with God or Spirit? Nay (1 Cor. x. 20), I do not forget or contravene what I then said. Idols and their sacrifices have no objective reality at all beyond that of their constituent wood or stone or flesh, but the dream of man gives them a subjective connection with evil, so that, repeating and insisting, as I do, that idols have no *objective* reality, except as stocks and stones, yet I say that, *subjectively*, "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice [in their thoughts and intentions] to demons, and not to God."

And, while it stands true that like as there is, in the

minds of believers, communion with Christ and with our fellow-believers in the breaking of bread; while it stands true that like as there is, subjectively, in the minds of Jews, communion with Jehovah in the sacrifices of the Jewish altar; similarly there is the possibility and danger of communion with mischief even in men's subjective imaginings of idols having demoniac reality, "I would not that ye should have [even this semblance of] fellowship with demons" (1 Cor. x. 20).

Indeed, there is an utter incompatibility between the Lord and idols which some may identify with demons, so that the moment one's own scruples, or the reminder of a neighbor, bring the mental association of idols and demons into one's memory, it is impossible (1 Cor. x. 21) to "drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table and of the table of demons." Then the apostle repeats his assertion of liberty for the strong-minded believer to go, if he be inclined, to an idolatrous friend's banquet, and eat, without question, of whatever may be provided, whether slain in the idol's temple or not; and this is accompanied by a warning to desist from such strong-minded exercise of freedom, if any weak-minded companion draw attention to the conceivable association of the meat with idolatry.

Such, in brief, is the connection and train of thought in which St. Paul makes this, his earliest, reference to the Lord's Supper; and now let us examine the passage and seek for the instruction it can give us concerning the celebration and use of the Christian breaking of bread.

In the forefront of the scene is mentioned "the cup of blessing which we bless," and presently afterwards is named the inconsistency of believers drinking of that "Lord's cup" and of the cup of demons. Obviously, as

the command at the institution was, "Drink of this, all of you"; so now, although the familiar designation of the parting was "breaking bread," without any specific mention of the wine, yet those who administered blessed the cup, and the recipients drank of it, just as frequently as they broke the bread and ate it.

Blessing the cup and breaking the bread, eating the latter and drinking of the former, were conjoint and associated acts, inseparable one from the other, in the original command of our Saviour, and seen in St. Paul's allusions to be similarly inseparable in apostolic practice. Though "*breaking* bread," and not *blessing* bread or *eating* bread, or drinking wine, had been accepted as an almost technical designation for the Lord's Supper, yet St. Paul and the Evangelists make it quite clear that there was no communicating in one kind only, no withholding of the cup from any section of the believers in those primitive and apostolic times.

Another interesting point which is conspicuous (1 Cor. x. 21), is the mention of the Lord's "*Table*," where the ideas of certain schools of thought would lead us to expect the mention of an *altar*. The Jewish "altar" (ver. 12) is named, and, assuredly, if the apostle had known anything of an altar in connection with the Lord's Supper, he must, in all accuracy, have named or alluded to it here; but no, he mentions the altar of the Mosaic ritual; but it is a "table,"[1] not an altar, with which he associates the Christian communion.

This, of course, we say with a full remembrance that,

[1] This argument seems to us to lose none of its force from the fact that in three passages of the Old Testament (Ezek. xli. 22, Mal. i. 7, 12), the word "table" is employed as a designation for the Jewish altar. If St. Paul had adopted that phrase and spoken of the Jewish table, the case would have been different. As it is, he writes about the Jewish *altar* and contrasts with it the Lord's *Table*; and the force of the contrast is very striking.

in a figurative sense, a Christian "altar" is named in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 10—16); but that "altar" was one "outside the gate," "outside the camp," on which Jesus suffered and, by His own blood, sanctified the people. On what "altar," outside the gate and enclosure[1] of Jerusalem, did Jesus so suffer except upon the cross? Our Christian "altar," in this only[2] mention of it in the New Testament, is thus clearly seen to be the cross; and upon that altar or cross the sacrifices we are urged to offer are, not bread and wine, or a repetition or commemoration of Christ's death—not these, but (ver. 13) the "bearing His reproach," and (ver. 15) "the sacrifice of praise continually to God," that is, the fruit of our lips as we confess to His name[3]—these sacrifices of patience, fidelity,

[1] παρεμβολή.

[2] An attempt is sometimes made to construct a theory of fitness or necessity for a Christian altar upon earth, other than the cross of Jesus, by reason of "the golden altar that was before the throne" in the heaven of the Apocalypse (*vide* Rev. vi. 9, viii. 3, 5, ix. 13, xi. 1, xiv. 18, xvi. 7). It should be remembered, however, that this altar was in front of the throne upon which the Lamb sat. Christ, the Lamb, was on the throne, at God's right hand. He was not represented as being in any sense at or upon that golden altar. Upon that altar not Christ, nor any memorial of Christ, is offered, but (Rev. viii. 3) the prayers of saints or Christians and much incense; and he who offers at that altar is not Christ, but an "angel." Throughout these pages of the Apocalypse it is deeply interesting to observe how consistently the idea is maintained that, although Christ ever retains the dignity of our Priest and High Priest, yet He is not now engaged in the priestly work of making or offering a sacrifice; but, that work having been once for all perfected and finished on the cross, He reigns a King at God's right hand and procures (ἐντυγχάνει) for men all good things according to the will of God (κατὰ Θεόν, Rom. viii. 27).

It is worth adding, for those who are capable of drawing inferences from the Apocalypse, that in the perfected ideal of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 22) there was "no temple," and, by consequence, no altar; "for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it."

In other words, with God and the Lamb present by the Spirit in our spirits, there is in us no room, nor occasion, nor necessity for any material temple or material altar.

It must, surely, be all but needless to remind the reader that the altar named in Matt. v. 24, and some few other passages of the New Testament, is the Jewish altar in the Temple at Jerusalem, and is no more a direct example or obligation for us Christians to have altars in our churches, than is circumcision, or any other rite of Judaism which has perished and "vanished away" (Heb. viii. 13), an example which it is our duty to copy.

[3] ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

and praise, together with (ver. 16) the remembrance "to do good and to communicate"[1]—these sacrifices, offered upon the altar of Christ's cross, are those with which God is well pleased. But, in connection with the "breaking of bread," Scripture knows of no "altar," nor of any "sacrifice."

In connection with the breaking of bread, St. Paul pointedly avoids the word "altar," though it was forced upon his attention and pressed into his employment by his argument from the sacrifices and the altar of Israel after the flesh; and he as pointedly uses the word "table," "the Lord's Table." Here then, we see, in the apostle's language, not only an absence of sacerdotal and sacrificial terms and thoughts in connection with the Christian breaking of bread, but a pointed and remarkable avoidance of any such term or thought. He, as it were, turns aside and goes out of his way from altars, as a Jewish shadow, that he may attach himself to the Table and communion and fellowship of his beloved Lord. And when another New Testament writer speaks to Hebrew believers of a Christian altar and the sacrifices of Christians, that writer makes it quite plain to every moderately careful reader that, in his figurative language, the "altar" is the cross of Christ, not the Lord's Table; and the sacrifices are, not bread and wine, but patience, fidelity, praise, well-doing, and fellow-helpfulness.

And now let us look at another aspect of truth presented to us by St. Paul in the passage under consideration (1 Cor. x. 17). The "bread," throughout the Supper, is here spoken of as "bread." No change is hinted at as taking place in its substance or objective character; or, if there be any change of substance, if

[1] κοινωνίας, fellowship, helpfulness.

there be any transubstantiation, observe what is its nature. The statement is, not bread is changed into and becomes Christ, but we, the Christian multitude, the *hoi polloi* of Christendom, "are one bread, one body." It is *we*, believers of every age, clime, color, and sex, *we* are the one bread; *we* are the one body; and the divinely appointed sign of this, by Christ's grace its instrument, is that *we all* partake of "the one bread." We, by the eating of the bread in remembrance of Christ and in obedience to His command, are one body. If there were any *objective* transformation here implied, it would be of us all into bread and into a body of some kind. Such an objective change of Christian men into bread, or into any living unit which can, without metaphor, be called a body, is contradicted by every special sense and by every other test to which such a question can be subjected.

But this union of us all into one body, the *figurative* body of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 27), in which we are all members in particular, is just the very drift and point of St. Paul's argument. At one time he teaches that, by the Spirit, we are all baptized into this one body (1 Cor. xii. 13). At another time, he teaches that it is in eating the bread we are one body. If, then, any reader wishes to press this language beyond the realm of figure into the literal and direct use of words, so be it, but observe the language and press its letter fairly and truly. It will then lead you to the untenable result that men are objectively changed into a loaf, or loaves, or fragments of bread; or men are objectively changed by Christian baptism, and by the Christian Supper, into a material body different from that of their own humanity. This, however, is a very different result from that transformation of bread into Christ's body which is the *credendum* of

those against whom Scripture bears such striking testimony.

But it may be urged, does not part of this very passage itself (1 Cor. x. 16) designate the contents of the cup of blessing as the blood of Christ? Let us see. What are the precise words? "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ?" In this interrogatory of the apostle, that which is taught is that the cup is, not the blood, but *a communion of the blood*. Just as we have already seen that, in his history of the original institution, St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 25) represents our Saviour as declaring the cup to be, not His blood but *the new covenant* in His blood; so now, to say the cup is, in some sense, a communion or participation in the blood of Christ, is altogether different from saying that the cup is the blood of Christ.

If the cup be a token and means by which pious believers pledge and associate one another in the sufferings and benefits of Christ's precious blood-shedding, this is a natural and sufficient explanation, surely, of the words, "This cup is a communion of the blood of Christ;" and yet this plain, grammatical explanation of the words, involves no objective change in the wine any more than a parallel interpretation of the words, "This bread is a communion of the body of Christ," involves any objective change of bread into the flesh of our Lord. The bread and wine are a sign and means of incorporation or embodying for the pious Christian; but this incorporation, as we have already learned from ver. 17, is of the multitude into one figurative body, of which Christ is indeed the head (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27; xi. 3; Eph. v. 23), and all we are members in particular.

So, then, this tenth chapter of the first Epistle to the

Corinthians teaches us that, in the breaking of bread, Christians are concerned with a "table" and those things which a table implies, and not with an altar and those things which are implied by an altar; and, moreover, this passage teaches us that, in the Lord's Supper, the bread and the wine—which were both enjoined by Christ, and were both administered and received by the primitive Christians—are a sign and means of fellowship and union between all Christians with one another, and with their one common Head and Lord.

In all this there is no trace of "orientation," as turning eastward has been called of late, nor of any special posture or vestment. Neither is there anything that is, when closely examined, reconcilable with the idea of bread and wine being in any way objectively converted into the body and blood of Christ.

(*b.*) 1 *Cor.* xi. 17–34.

And now we must proceed to study St. Paul's second reference to the Christian "breaking of bread." He no longer illustrates the peril of fancied contamination in a feast of things sacrificed to idols by the union and communion that arise in the Christian breaking of bread. In this second passage (1 Cor. xi. 17–34) St. Paul deals with his correspondents in the matter of certain abuses and corruptions which he hears, and partly believes, have crept into their celebration of the Lord's Supper. In the first three verses of this passage St. Paul alludes to the schisms and heresies which had arisen from different sources among the Corinthian Christians. Whatever good purpose, of testing and making manifest (ver. 19) those who were worthy of approval among them, these divisions might effect, and whether they arose from ques-

tions regarding the parts to be enacted, in the assembly of believers, by men and women respectively, or whether they concerned the head-dress of men and women, or whether they related to indecorum and irreverence in the breaking of bread, they sprang out of a contentious spirit which was altogether opposed to the religion of Christ; and the result of this contentiousness, in its various manifestations, was that the Christian coming together in the Church (*ecclesia*, the popular assembling), instead of building up believers in their most holy faith, was "not for the better, but for the worse" (ver. 17).

"When ye come together, therefore, into one place,[1] this is not to eat the Lord's Supper" (ver. 20). These are most remarkable words. When ye come together, in the Christian assembly, for the very purpose of celebrating the Lord's Supper, if ye bring this spirit of contention, this mind of the heretic which will obstinately choose its own way in defiance of the concessions that should issue from brotherly love, this heart of the schismatic who will rend the one body of Christ's disciples in spite of the divine precept that we should love one another and be one even as He and the Father are one—if ye come to the Lord's Supper with such contentious minds and hearts, ye frustrate the holiest of ordinances; ye make your breaking of bread and drinking of wine to be no Lord's Supper at all.

So entirely does the validity of the sacrament depend on the state of mind and heart in which it is approached. Contentiousness in the recipient destroys union and communion among those whose oneness among themselves and with the Lord is essential and indispensable for any real participation in the Lord's Supper. As we have hitherto

[1] ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.

found in the bread and wine no objective change that was to constitute the central act, or form any part of the Supper's administration, so now we are instructed that a particular temper and disposition in the partaker is absolutely the condition *sine quâ non*, for that sacred act of holiest worship.

It may be well to observe here that this verse (20) supplies us with a second Scriptural name for the Christian "breaking of bread." It is, in accordance with its first institution, a supper[1] (as the Germans rightly call it, an *Abend-mahl*, an *evening* meal). Here, in this Scriptural designation of the rite, we are provided with a perpetual, and assuredly a sufficient, answer to those who make *evening* communions a reproach to any who practice them in accordance with apostolic example and in obedience to the Lord's command. After laying down the general principle that a lack of fellowship and unity in the hearts of communicants frustrates their celebration, and makes their act to be the eating of something quite different from the Lord's Supper, the apostle next proceeds to point out some of the particulars in which this anti-Christian spirit was then manifesting itself at Corinth. "In eating, every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken."[2]

The condition of things indicated is this:—For the Christian supper each believer, or each party of believers, was wont to bring a portion of meat and drink, such as accorded with the ability of the contributor. These portions were then made into a common stock, out of which the viands for the love-feast and the portions of bread and wine were provided in common for all the communicants alike and equally. None felt he was entitled to one part

[1] δεῖπνον. [2] μεθύει.

of the provisions but was debarred from participation in another part of the common meal. Each and all should be satisfied with an ample, but not an excessive, share.

Instead of this, however, what St. Paul blamed at Corinth was that some contributors retained, as it were, a preferential claim upon their own provisions. These they grasped and ate as their own, before any who brought no contribution, or who brought a contribution less in quantity or inferior in quality, could take a share. Such is the force of "In eating, each taketh before other his own supper." Greediness and selfishness and irreverence were the sources of such conduct; and the result is portrayed in the words, "One is hungry, and another is drunken." The fuller phrase would be, One is insufficiently supplied with meat and drink, while another has taken amply and selfishly, or even to excess, of both meat and drink. It was, indeed, time there should be apostolic rebuke and correction of such a state of things; and St. Paul, with all his charity and all his courtesy, has both fidelity and courage for the occasion.

What!—is the purport of his remonstrance, setting aside cases of manifest excess, and looking at first only to those of indecorous greed—have ye not houses, apart from the common meeting-place of the brethren, in which, if uncontrollable and irresistible craving for food be upon you, it may be gratified without the display of haste that waits for no fellow-Christian, without obtruding on fellow-worshippers the ravenous appetite of the animal nature that is in us? Or is it so that, although you have such houses, although you can command such privacy for the concealment of the indecorous, yet you are impudently scornful of your brethren, who constitute the Church (the *ecclesia* or assembly) of God, and you are careless

of affronting them with your improprieties? Or has your pride of wealth and its ostentation reached such a pitch that you are minded, of set purpose, to put them to shame whose possessions and means are none, or are less than yours? What shall I say to you in such a state of things? Shall I praise you, as I am wont to do, as it is my delight to do? No. In this I praise you not.

Then upon this reproof (ver. 22), upon this exhibition of their conduct before their own eyes, follows the apostle's record of what he had received in the way of revelation from the Lord, of what he had, too, previously delivered to the Corinthians in the way of instruction, as to the Saviour's original institution of the Supper. This record we have already examined, in its immensely interesting details, in earlier pages of this essay, so that it must suffice, at present, to remind the reader of the words, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," as having been shown to be the most exact—as it is the earliest—record of the Saviour's words; as being the authentic exposition of the briefer form, "This is My blood"; and as throwing light upon the sense of the parallel expression, "This is My body." If "This is My blood" was the abridged form of "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," we can hardly fail to believe that "This is My body" was a similarly abridged form of "This bread is the new covenant in My body"; and these formularies, as we have seen, teach a spiritual lesson without giving occasion, or indeed leaving room, for any doctrine of transubstantiation or objective change in the elements of bread and wine.

In connection with this earliest extant written record of the Saviour's instituting the Lord's Supper, we have also noticed the injunction, "This do"—exercise your

minds and hearts in all this fellow-helpfulness towards one another, and in all this loving thankfulness to God for His gifts and graces—"this do, as oft as ye drink, for My remembrance." In this injunction we observed the perpetually recurring frequency of the communion prescribed, "as oft as ye drink"; and we also noticed that this communion in eating and drinking was instituted by Christ for a "*remembrance*," not for a *vision* of Himself; whereas, on the supposition of the bread and wine being objectively changed into the body and blood of Christ, a vision of Him, and not a remembrance, would be the result.

"For," proceeds the apostle (ver. 26), "as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye preach [1] [or tell the tidings of] the Lord's death till He come."

In these words, again, as so often in similar passages of Scripture, the mention of "the cup" and "this bread" is most worthy to be noticed; for, assuredly, if St. Paul had any knowledge of an objective change of the cup of wine into a cup of blood, or of the bread into Christ's objective body, so important a doctrine, so stupendous a miracle, could hardly fail to be recognized by Him in some such natural and truthful phrase as "So oft as ye eat the body of Christ and drink His blood," ye *show* the Lord's death. The absence of these words and the mention of "the cup" merely, without reference to its marvellous contents, and of "the bread" categorically, as the other element still, even after the Lord's words had been spoken over it, are intimations of most satisfactory distinctness that the apostle of the Gentiles knew nothing of any objective change in the elements of the blessed Supper.

[1] καταγγέλλετε.

But the thought may occur to the English reader of this twenty-sixth verse, if he be unacquainted with the original Greek, that here we find the apostle speaking of the Supper as *showing* Christ's death until His coming; and this obviously bears the semblance of a vision to be *shown* and seen objectively, not of a set of associations to be remembered subjectively. Such a thought, however, rests only on the accident that our current English version has changed the Greek word,[1] and its root-figure of announcing tidings, delivering a message, into the different metaphor of *showing*, with its root-idea of something to be seen. If we keep literally and faithfully to St. Paul's line of thought, as indicated by his expressions, we read, "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye announce, like messengers, the Lord's death until His coming."

Thus vanishes even this semblance of a verbal support for the notion that the bread and wine present a vision of Christ's body, and not a remembrance of His redeeming death. St. Paul's thought is, In the time that must intervene between this present and that glorious future when Christ shall come again, as often as, with fitting associations of thought and with becoming purposes and acts and words, ye participate in the Supper of your Lord, ye do, by commemorative act as well as by attendant words, tell forth to men the blessed tidings that God so loved the world that He gave His son to die as a ransom for all men. Such is the purport and meaning of each celebration of the Supper. In every repetition of the breaking of bread, ye preach to men that Christ died to save them from sin, that His body was given and His blood was shed for the remission of sin, that God might remit and pardon our transgressions, that we might dis-

[1] καταγγέλλετε.

miss and put away our sins. This, and no less than this, ye declare, by your every communion in the bread and wine, is the divine aim and object of Christ's dying for you, of His giving His body and shedding His blood for your sake.

Following up this reference to the death of Christ, the apostle (ver. 27) continues, "Wherefore whosoever eateth the bread or drinketh the cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord." The Corinthians had already (ver. 20) been told that unworthy participation of the bread and wine defeated the purpose and destroyed the nature of the Lord's Supper, made it to be no eating of the Lord's Supper at all. Now St. Paul warns them that such frustration of their communion is not a mere act of folly and waste of energy. It is more. It is a desecration of holy things. It is a manifestation of irreverence in connection with symbols which the Saviour has appointed to be associated, in the minds of His disciples, with the redeeming sacrifice of His body broken and His blood shed for us; and who can irreverently bring acts of greed, and gluttony, and inebriety, and self-seeking, and contumely into such a sacred feast of loving fellowship with God and man, without sin and guilt?

In such unworthy eating of the bread or drinking of the cup—mark, there is no departure from these terms; there is no hint of any objective change in the elements—but he who unworthily eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord is guilty,[1] and that in connection with the body and the blood of the Lord. No measure of this guilt in each case is given. According to the profanity and conscious irreverence of every such offender, the

[1] ἔνοχος.

guilt will vary from that of being "in danger of" trifling with holy things—so the Greek word for "guilty," is translated in Matthew v. 21, 22—to that of actually "crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh, and putting Him to an open shame," as is the description of several kinds of conscious and wilful wickedness named in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 6).

The guilt of those who unworthily partake of the bread and wine in the Supper is connected with the Lord's body and blood: but we must no more, on this account, insist on there being an objective presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Corinthian Supper, than on there being an objective cross and an objective Christ in the crucifixion and open shame mentioned by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the latter instance no one dreams of Christ as being crucified otherwise than subjectively, in the minds of the wicked; and it is as inadmissible to understand the body and blood, in the former instance, as being anything but subjectively present.

In contrast with this danger of trifling with holy symbols, the apostle lays down an opposite course. "But," he says (ver. 28), to avoid this risk and guilt of unworthy participation, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup." How strange, if St. Paul believed the bread and wine were objectively changed into flesh and blood, that he should persist, even here, in designating the elements by the same terms as were applied to them before the prescribed blessing and giving of thanks! Even in worthy participation, after self-examination, just as the Evangelist speaks of the cup still containing the fruit of the vine, so

the apostle writes of eating the bread and drinking of the cup.

Another point, well worthy of attention in the present day, is here brought under our notice by the apostle's words. To judge from the teaching of some modern Christians, it might be supposed that the injunction in this passage of Holy Writ was, Let an intending communicant get himself examined by a clergyman. Let him resort to a confessional. Let him not quit himself like a man, but let him kneel beside a fellow-being and whisper his every failing, his every sin, into the ear of one whose position bears too much resemblance to that of lording it over God's heritage. Such are the maxims of not a few modern Churchmen; but they are wide as the poles asunder from the teaching of the apostle.

Doubtless, if any believer had wronged his fellow-man, and if acknowledgment of the wrong constituted a material part of just reparation, St. Paul would urge, as did St. James (Jas. v. 16), that we should "confess our sins one to another;" or, in view of the duty and advantage of the prayer of a righteous man accompanied by work,[1] St. Paul, like St. James, would urge Christians to confess themselves sinners in need of such intercession, and to choose confidants, not necessarily officers of the Church, that with such confidants they might exchange the confession of sins. But even this kind and measure of voluntary and friendly confession is not brought into connection by the apostles by the Supper of the Lord, so far are they from the mediæval and modern practice of auricular and sacramental confession.

What St. Paul enjoins is, "Let a man [each man, every man] examine himself."[2] Let a man bring him-

[1] δέησις δικάιου ἐνεργουμένη. [2] δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν.

self to the proof; let him see that he is no reprobate, but is up to the mark and standard of Christ; let him compare his thoughts with the mind of Christ (1 Cor. ii. 16); let him ascertain that he has the spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9), and is bringing forth the fruits of that Spirit (Gal. v. 22); let a man thus bestir his own intellectual activity concerning God and Christ and his heart and life: let there be no weak dependence on another, but only in the strength that comes from God and his Christ, let each man awake and seek for light and purity, and zeal and grace; "let a man examine himself" upon his own tremendous responsibility, as in the sight of God and the Lord, "and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup."

In these words of the apostle is wise and much-needed instruction, alike for those who strive to share the labor and responsibility of self-scrutiny with some official partner, and for those who neglect the solemn duty of self-examination in connection, particularly, with the remembrance of Christ in breaking of bread.

This special command, to examine one's self and to keep the mind religiously on the alert, in the Supper of the Lord, is then enforced by another consideration which St. Paul adduces (ver. 29). "For," adds the apostle, "he that eateth and drinketh"—(the word "unworthily" is not given in the best manuscripts)—"eateth and drinketh judgment[1] to himself, if he discern not the body." Such is the most reliable reading here, "if he discern not *the body*." Of course, the *Lord's* body is signified just as in the authorized version it is expressed. And now let us proceed to examine the meaning of these important words.

[1] κρίμα.

The apostle teaches that self-examination, in preparing for the Lord's Supper, must include the ascertaining whether we "discern the body," for fear of "eating and drinking judgment to ourselves." What is meant by this "discerning the body," manifestly the body of Christ? The words[1] of the original signify a failure in judging or distinguishing between the body and something else, not discerning the difference between the body and something else.

What is that something else? Is it not obviously the bread? And have we not here a distinct and most remarkable intimation from St. Paul that to confound the material bread with any objective presence of Christ's body, to fail in discerning between that bread objectively present and the body of the Lord which can only be mentally, spiritually, and subjectively present, is, by materializing spiritual things, to eat and drink judgment to ourselves?

Instead of confounding the bread with the objective body of Christ, present in the bread, or with the bread, or as the bread, we must, on pain of judgment, distinguish between the bread, which is one thing—a symbol and material instrument—and the body of Christ, which is quite another thing, absent in its objectivity but present subjectively to the mind and heart of him who, as he looks upon and participates in the bread and wine, thankfully remembers the one sacrifice of Christ's body and blood for the sins of the whole world; and devotedly calls to mind that, with that sacrifice of body and blood and life, he must be so united and incorporated, that he would, for Christ, be willing to be offered up as a sacrifice (Phil. ii. 17), to be poured out as a libation (2 Tim. iv. 6;—yea, would be willing for the brethren to lay down his life (1 John iii. 16).

[1] μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα.

What a difference between the mere material symbols and instruments of bread and wine—objects which are palpable to the senses—and the sacrificed body and blood of Christ which are partaken of by coming to Him and by believing in Him (John vi. 35), subjects for the believer's mind. Some such vigorous conception of Christ's body broken and of His blood shed, as the one sacrifice, quite distinct and different from the bread and wine which recall these associations, must be in the mind of the partaker in the Lord's Supper; or, failing this, he slights a holy commemoration, he materializes a sacred and spiritual worship, and, so doing, he eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.

And yet, in another sense, must the body of Christ be "discerned" by the worthy partaker in the Lord's Supper; for all we, all believers, are one body, even "the body of Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 27): and this, with its lessons of fellowship, helpfulness, and love, must be thoroughly and distinctly realized by all who would be meet participants in the breaking of bread.

Thus, if any man fail to distinguish and discern between the objective symbol, bread, and the spiritual reality of Christ's body sacrificed and of His body, the Church, such an one, in proportion to the wilfulness of his negligence, eateth and drinketh to himself judgment.

This "judgment" is, obviously, a result and consequence which must follow upon the profanity of taking bread and presuming that, objectively and materially, that bread must convey to us the body of Christ and incorporation therewith: and what can be more certain than that, as the scales of culpable ignorance fall from our eyes, as the light of truth increasingly shows all things in their real character, either in this world or in that which is to

come, negligence and profanity in sacred acts and holy worship will not only bring upon us the just and merciful and exactly discerning judgment of God, but will disquiet our own conscience and self-knowledge, and so will compel us to judge ourselves?

Thus do unworthy communicants eat and drink various degrees of judgment to themselves. But, moreover, adds St. Paul (ver. 30), "For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and many sleep." There is, indeed, no necessity for here supposing reference to some *miraculous* sickness and death that were in operation among the Corinthians. Such may have been the state of things. An unmistakable intervention of the divine power may have been at that time displayed at Corinth: but such a supposition is not necessitated by the words of St. Paul, for, given, amongst any body of men, such gluttony and inebriety and hunger and want as he depicts, given such greed and such excess, even at the sacred feast of believers, and what would be the general habits of their ordinary and less religious life? And from such habits of destitution on the one hand, and excess on the other, what result would be more sure to follow than sickness among many, and torpor and even death in not a few? These consequences of sin and profanity were some of the outward workings of that judgment of God and of their own consciences in which men involved themselves, who exhibited the irreverence and want of self-control which St. Paul describes as discrediting the Corinthian Church when he addressed to them his first epistle.

After this appeal to facts, and the natural sequence and interdependence of facts, which must have been notorious in Corinth at that time, the apostle sums up in words that call back to memory the phrases in which he

had been rebuking the Corinthian desecration of the Lord's Supper. "But if," he says, "we discerned[1] ourselves, we should not be judged."[2] As, before, self-examination[3] was made to include "discerning[4] the body" of Christ, so now this verb "discern"[5] is used instead of that previously employed to denote self-examining: and so, with an instance of that playing upon words and their compounds which is quite in accordance with the custom of the apostle, we learn that "If we would judge ourselves distinctly concerning things whose difference is important, we should not be judged subsequently by the judgment of God and of our own consciences." Nay, it is added (ver. 32), "But when we are judged by the Lord we are chastened, in order that we may not be judged to our condemnation together with the world"[6] (another instance of playing upon a compound of the Greek verb used throughout for judging, discerning, etc.).

All this is a clear setting forth of the loving mercy with which our God judges and chastens, with a view to save us from future and more terrible judgment and condemnation. Still, clear as it is, this verse (32) throws no more light upon our present subject. Then (ver. 33) the exhortation is, "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together for the eating,[7] wait for one another." Let there be no impatient, disrespectful haste. "If any hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto judgment."[8] If any man be possessed by uncontrollable appetite, let him, as was implied in ver. 22, eat something at home, and so tame the ungovernableness of his hunger before he joins the congregation or *ecclesia* of the Lord. Let this be done to avoid unseemliness and

[1] ἐι δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν. [2] οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα. [3] ἑαυτὸν δοκιμάζειν.
[4] διακρίνειν τὸ σῶμα. [5] διακρίνειν. [6] κατακριθῶμεν.
[7] εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν. [8] εἰς κρίμα.

the judgment of God and of our own conscience, that must, in time, sooner or later, follow upon unseemly and unworthy participation in so sacred a duty as breaking of bread in the Christian assembly. "And the rest [any details about which you have consulted me, or about which you may be in doubt] will I set in order when I come."

With these words of decorous common sense, St. Paul takes leave of our subject, and passes to other topics.

A truly interesting and important episode has the apostle thus left us in connection with the Supper of the Lord. He gives the earliest written record of its institution. He points out the frequency of its commemoration. He shows how the communion of the Lord's Supper depends for its validity upon the state of mind of its recipient. He insists upon the necessity of clearly recognizing, on the one hand, the objective elements of the blessed bread and wine, and, on the other hand, the subjective and spiritual presence of Christ in the believer's mind.

As of something distinct from the objective elements of bread and wine, there must be a *discerning*, in the mind of the communicant, of that which is subjectively present in the adoring memory and love of the believer, namely, the body of Christ slain once for all, the blood of Christ shed once for all, to put away the sin of the world; nor will this *discerning* between the bread and wine on the one hand, and the body and blood of Christ on the other, be adequate and complete unless, together with the subjective realization of the spiritual presence of Christ the Head, there be also a sympathetic and loving fellowship with all the believers in Jesus who constitute His catholic or universal Church, the members in particular of His figurative body.

Without this *discerning* of the body of Christ, alike in Himself the head, and in the whole of the constituting parts or members, there can be, says St. Paul, no worthy communion of the Lord's Supper, but only a selfish, careless, stolid, and irreverent trifling with holy things in such a manner as to bring upon men the judgment of God and of their own awakening conscience. Thus definite and important is St. Paul's instruction; but, clear and many-sided as is this passage of the apostle's teaching in connection with the Lord's Supper, it contains no sanction, as must have been observed, of those doctrines and practices which were rife in the mediæval ages, and which it is the aim of some men to resuscitate in the present day.

Instead of auricular and sacramental confession to a Church officer, the apostle urges that a man should *examine himself*. Instead of partaking in one kind only, the apostle enjoins us to eat of the bread *and drink of the cup*. Instead of discouraging and denouncing nocturnal celebrations, the apostle teaches us to come together for the Lord's SUPPER. Instead of individual and isolated administration, the apostle emphasizes the duty of Christians to wait for one another, that there may be a common and congregational participation. Whereas much is said, nowadays, of vestments and postures and priests, the apostle is significantly silent on all these points. Whereas mediævalism speaks of altars, the apostle, of obviously set purpose, names *the Lord's Table*.

While some insist on an objective presence of Christ's body in, or with, or instead of the visible bread and wine, the apostle solemnly warns us against such materializing of things spiritual, and goes the length of teaching that, if any man allows himself to be so superstitiously child-

ish, or so profanely careless, as not to discern and distinguish between things differing so widely as the blessed bread and wine objectively present and the body of Christ spiritually present to the believer's heart and mind, or the same body of Christ metaphorically represented by all members of the Church, then—the apostle teaches—such sinful childishness, or such profane carelessness and confusion of mind in things sacred, make a man guilty in connection with the body and blood of Christ; in other words, they render him liable to the judgment of God and of his own conscience, as one who lightly and irreverently fails to image to himself the saving love of the Son of God upon the cross, who is mentally enslaved by the elements of bread and wine, instead of setting before his memory and his imagination the sufferings, the wants, and joys, and hopes, and capacities, developed and still undeveloped, of the whole body of believers, and of all men for whom the Lord gave His body to be broken and His blood to be shed.

Such is the contrast between the modern and mediæval doctrine of an objective presence of Christ in the bread and wine, and the teaching and admonition of the apostle concerning the peril of confounding things which differ so widely as the mechanical reception of bread and wine on the one hand, and on the other hand the devout and loving and active communion of believers in the memory of Christ and His death, as well as in helpful sympathy with Christ's body, the Church or whole assembly of the faithful.

§ 5. *St. Paul and the "Breaking of Bread" at Troas.*

From this contrast between mediævalism and apostolic truth, whose force comes out the more strongly the more

deeply and reverently the subject is studied, we proceed to notice another reference to the Lord's Supper which occurs in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles.

From Ephesus, where St. Paul was when he wrote the first Epistle to the Corinthians (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 8; Acts xix. 1, 10, 21; xx. 1, 2, 3, etc.), he had now passed through Macedonia and Greece, and had returned, eastward, to Troas.

These journeys had occupied several months. Some chronologists place an interval of eighteen months or more between the composition of the first Corinthian epistle and the visit to Troas. The exact length of the intervening period is unimportant for our present inquiry. Suffice it to say that there is no question but that, some months after writing what we call the first Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul arrived at Troas, as is described in the history of the Acts (xx. 6—12), and there "abode seven days."

On the first day of the week, we learn, there was a meeting of the believers *to break bread*. Whether such breaking of bread, in the congregation, had now become a weekly observance at Troas, or was still a daily practice, may be questioned. Possibly, this meeting is named, as taking place on the first day of the week, only to mark it more definitely as the last assembling with St. Paul, on that visit of his to Troas, or to designate it as the time when the fall and recovery of Eutychus occurred. This is quite possible. There *may* have been a "breaking of bread" every day in the Christian assembly. This, however, does not seem so much in keeping with probability and with the demands that could be made on the time of a Church consisting mainly of comparatively poor and busy men, as is the other opinion that, while from house

to house, at each house, there was a daily "breaking of bread" in obedience to the Lord, the congregational communion had already become a weekly observance, and was held especially on that first day of the week which should ever be, to the Christian, a day of thankful and triumphant remembrance of the resurrection and all which it implies.

Be this as it may, whether the Troadic Church's "breaking of bread" was daily or weekly, one point is clear—this was intended to be a *nocturnal* celebration. Not only were there "many lights" (ver. 8) in the room where they were assembled, but the apostle's discourse continued till the unusually late hour of midnight; and then it was that the fall of Eutychus, and his restoration, occurred; and then, about midnight, instead of earlier in the evening, as had been expected, St. Paul went up again, and broke bread, and *tasted* it.[1] After that he "talked a long while, even till break of day." It was a midnight celebration, after all the rejoicing and all the ordinary meals of a "Lord's Day" (Rev. i. 10), or first day of the week.

There is no trace of any fast preceding it. Indeed, the remarkable expression, "tasted," which is here employed by the historian, seems to imply that the recent abuses at Corinth, and probably at other places, had induced the apostle to separate, in this his practice, participation in an ordinary meal from the breaking of bread in the Church assembly. However much the relief of hunger might be still combined with the family breaking of bread at home, the partaking of the Lord's Supper, in the congregation, was, on this occasion at least, only a

[1] γευσάμενος.

"tasting" for the apostle.[1] It would be rash to draw too positive conclusions from this single recorded instance; but it may be that we have here an indication of a change, as already practised, which was, in after times, assuredly to become a necessity and a custom—that of separating the Lord's Supper from the love-feast.

It is all the more interesting to observe this possible avoidance of a peril and a temptation for the Church, because it brings out into greater conspicuousness the fact that, even after the abuses at Corinth, and just after St. Paul had revisited that Grecian Church, and doubtless had, as he promised (1 Cor. xi. 34), "set in order" other points besides those named in his letter, he still recognized no demands, of necessity or of propriety, which called for any deviation from the original institution and usage of making the believers' breaking of bread to be at the close of the day and its work and its meals—an evening or a midnight celebration.

It is obvious to remark, in this narrative of what occurred at Troas, how close was the resemblance to, if not the imitation of, our Saviour's institution, even in such an accidental and unimportant detail as the Troadic breaking of bread having taken place in an "upper chamber"—in this case, as we learn, on "the third loft" or story. In this, almost the latest glimpse given us by the New Testament of the primitive "breaking of bread," or communion of the Lord's Supper, as throughout its Scriptural history, nor time, nor place, nor vestment, nor attitude was deemed essential or important.

What was indispensable was that, in partaking of bread and wine (or apparently of any other beverage), there

[1] Unless, indeed, we adopt the unlikely supposition that the γευσαι, *I taste*, is used here in the unusual signification of eating a meal.

should be a devout and thankful remembrance of Christ's death and of its redemptive purposes of divine love, a union and incorporation of communicants, in heart and mind and act and life, with Christ the head and with all the members of His body, the Church. These things being postulated as essential, and a warning given of the necessity of distinguishing between the elements of bread and wine which are objectively different from the "body," which is Christ and His Church, all other matters are of minor importance. They can be set in order when the apostle visits any Church, or they can be changed, from time to time, as circumstances may require, provided only all be done "decently and in order" and "in charity."

Here we might conclude our investigation of the Scripture testimony concerning the institution and apostolic usage of the Lord's Supper, with the remark that not only have the purest and holiest vouchers of antiquity failed to supply us with a vestige of proof or apology for the doctrine of an objective presence of Christ in the elements of blessed bread and wine, but, moreover, these very vouchers, instead of witnessing for such an objective presence and for the inferences and doctrines and practices connected with it by the mediævalists, are plain and emphatic in their statement of the peril of impiety incurred by careless or profane confounding of the bread and wine with the body of our Lord. Strangely enough —nay, with surpassing wisdom in the merciful providence of God—Scripture warns us all that our danger lies in the direction of materializing spiritual things, and drifting into so degrading a superstition as the belief that while there is a consubstantiation, or transubstantiation, or insubstantiation of the elements into Christ, and of Christ into the elements, there is no need to "discern"

and distinguish between the memorial elements, which are bread and wine, and the "body" whose head is our blessed Lord and all we its members in particular. The case, in Scripture, is thus ample and irrefragable against any objective presence of Christ in the bread and wine.

§ 6. *Scripture Promises of Christ's Presence, not more in the Lord's Supper than on other Occasions.*

But, as if omission to inculcate this strange doctrine were not proof enough against it, as if warning against the risk and sin of such a confusion of things spiritual with things material were not enough to make us safe against the danger, we are actually supplied by the primitive writings of Christianity, and by our blessed Saviour's own words, with yet another and a very remarkable safeguard against so serious a peril.

When the question is raised, On what distinct grounds of Scripture proof does the doctrine of Christ's alleged objective presence in the bread and wine rest? we have seen that whereas the support of this doctrine is based on a "*proleptic*" interpretation of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, such "*proleptic*" interpretation implies that Jesus used language in a highly artificial and non-natural manner; and this supposition is so abhorrent to our idea of the Saviour's simplicity, that it could only be admitted under the pressure of such absolute logical necessity as by no means exists in the passage under consideration. There it is a figurative and spiritual interpretation of the phrase, "Eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His blood," which is not only in perfect accord with the metaphors constantly adopted by Jesus and by the Old Testament writers, but which is made obviously appropriate, and indeed alone admissible, in the

sixth chapter of the fourth Gospel, by the principle therein laid down, that "The flesh profiteth nothing. it is the spirit that giveth life." And, yet again, the spiritual and figurative interpretation of that phrase, in that chapter, is rendered absolutely necessary, inasmuch as Christ Himself (ver. 35) defines "coming to Him" as that eating Him which satisfies hunger, and "believing on Him" as that drinking His blood which does away with thirst. Thus, as we have seen, the "proleptic" interpretation cannot be relied on as correct; and, if it could be accepted as true, it would yield no support (as we have further seen) to the amazing opinion that Christ's body is *objectively* present in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper.

Similarly, when we examined the other alleged Scripture proof of the same doctrine, it became apparent that the words, "This is My blood," are only an abridgment of the fuller form, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood": and in the same way, beyond a doubt, the words, "This is My body," must be interpreted, "This bread is the new covenant in My body"; and so, here again, even apart from the light thrown upon the shorter form of institution by such expressions as "I am the door," "I am the vine," and the like, there is no room left for thinking that our Saviour said only, "This is My blood." He is recorded to have said, This cup *is the new covenant*, a very different statement from the sacerdotalist interpretation of the abbreviated formulary.

So have we seen the only two apparent Scriptural proofs of the theory of an objective presence of Christ in the Supper fail to support that astounding opinion of the dark ages. All the other Scripture notices of the Lord's Supper have been strong and direct testimonies against any such erroneous opinion.

But now let us ask, in this absence of all specific Scripture promises of Christ's objective presence in the Supper of the Lord, whether there are not other very definite promises of Christ's presence, His general and His special presence either objectively or subjectively—we say not which at present—to be found in the New Testament, either referring to something entirely different from the Lord's Supper, or only, by possibility and inference, referring to it in common with other wholly different practices and occasions.

(*a.*) *Matt.* xviii. 19, 20.

In this connection of thought, who can fail to remember the words of Jesus as they stand in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (xviii. 19, 20)? "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together unto My name,[1] *there am I in the midst of them.*" Here is a most distinct and unquestionable promise that where two or three Christians are assembled, in their Christian character and spirit, to pray for something as followers of Christ—that is, with a condition, an "If it be possible," attached to all earthly boons; and only unconditionally for that sanctification and salvation which we know to be in accordance with the divine pleasure—there, in all assemblies for such common Christian prayer, "I," says Jesus, "am in the midst of them." Here is a promise of the Lord's presence amongst communicants of the Lord's Supper, if they be engaged in united Christian prayer; but then it is a promise of the same presence, on the same condition, with every Church assembly, with

[1] εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα.

every prayer-meeting, with every gathering for domestic worship, with every "two or three" disciples who, unitedly, put up their Christian supplications in any place, at any time, and however separately from the Lord's Supper.

This is a clear promise of Christ's real presence, either subjective or objective; but its fulfilment depends not on the intervention of bread and wine, or any other material thing or person, except the mental resolve, the disposition of heart and life, on the part of two believers—it may be, of two who are starving to death in a garret, or perishing shipwrecked on the barren rocks of a desolate and shelterless coast.

(*b.*) *John* xiv. 23.

No less precise is the promise of our Master as we find it in the fourth Gospel (John xiv. 23). In reply to the question, "Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest[1] Thyself to us, and not unto the world? Jesus said, "If *any* man[2] love Me, he will keep My words: and My Father will love him, and *we will come unto him, and make our abode*[3] *with him.*" What—a reader of the least thoughtfulness must ask himself, in view of these words—can be a clearer or more emphatic promise of the real and true presence of Christ and of the Father than this? However clearly implied—one cannot help reflecting—may be the assurance of Christ's spiritual presence in the communion of the Lord's Supper, it can convey to the mind nothing fuller or more divine, or more unlimited and unconditional, than that which is here pledged to *any man and every man* who will love Christ, and keep His commands in memory and do them.

To such an obedient and active lover of Jesus, God and

[1] ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτόν. [2] ἐάν τις. [3] μονήν.

Christ will not only come in the observance of some particular precept, but they will make *an abode, a remaining, a continuing residence, with such an one.* They will be with him when he prays, when he visits the sick, when he gives the cup of cold water to a disciple in Christ's name, when he breaks bread, when he is an hungered, when he is asleep, when he is stricken down by sickness, when in death he is carried to the mansions[1] or abodes of the Father's house—at all times, and in all places, and under all circumstances, as long as any man lovingly keeps Christ's words and does them, Christ and the Father will make their abode with any and every man so doing.

This divine presence of Christ is thus to be, not transient and occasional, but permanent. Had such a promise been attached exclusively, or been restricted in any special way, to the "breaking of bread," it might have made in favor of some of the theories of sacerdotalism; but, on the other hand, it would have been a promise of an *abiding* presence, and not of a presence confined to the mere moments during which the bread and wine are received and retained, as seems to be the notion of the mediævalists. This blessed promise, however, is not so tied down to any precise rite or ceremony; it is a general declaration that God and Christ will, in their divine fulness, come and abide with any loving and obedient disciple. This promise applies, indeed, to those who, with fitting conditions of mind and heart, partake of the Lord's Supper in compliance with the Master's word; but this presence is not conjoined, for them or for others, in any manner, with the elements of bread and wine, but with the sprit of loving obedience.

[1] μονάι; the same word is rendered "abode" in John xiv. 23.

God and His Christ will be as really present with them in every other act of obedience to the Saviour's word as in their participation at the Lord's Table. It is a full, general, abiding presence of Christ which is here promised, and by no means a presence at the Supper or with the bread and wine, differentiated from the presence vouchsafed where two or three are met for prayer, or where any one is assiduously discharging the commonest acts and duties of the life delineated as "faith which worketh by love." It is, we submit, impossible to imagine any promise of a real presence of Christ which could be fuller, more divine, or more continuous and all-embracing than this. However distinctly implied may be the assurance of a presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, such assurance can only be a promise of the same divine presence in the communion as in all other acts of Christian obedience; but, in face of this promise recorded in the fourth Gospel, it could be no more.

No doubt, participation in the Lord's Supper is, for those who (like ourselves) regard it as of permanent obligation, a part of our due obedience to Christ; and as such it is a channel by wilfully and disobediently closing which we may exclude Christ's presence; and, contrariwise, by obediently opening this channel, we should admit that blessed presence. To this extent, and in this way, one believes the Lord's Supper to be a special and appointed means of receiving the grace of Christ's divine presence; but though the means be special, and in each case of obedience a diverse act is the special means of grace, yet the presence is, in all cases, the same, for it is no less than divine and infinite, the abode of God and Christ in a man.

Before passing from this most gracious and remarkable

utterance of Jesus, there is yet another point to be noticed in connection with it.

According to the Lord's words (John xiv. 21, 23), taken together with the apostle's question (ver. 22), this presence of Christ and the Father with every loving disciple was to be a "manifestation," a "seeing" (ver. 19), vouchsafed to those who have Christ's commandments and keep them, but not vouchsafed to the world. Here is a noteworthy distinction. Christ shall be seen by believers, and yet not seen by those who believe not. Why? Will He only come and abide in places and at times where there is an absence of them that believe not? And, so, will His *objective* presence be granted to believers only and exclusively, and be strictly withheld from unbelievers?

If the presence be *objective*, the presence of an object, we can conceive no means by which that object can be present amongst men with eyes of equal power, and yet all who hold one opinion shall see it, and all who hold a contrary opinion, though looking in the same direction, at the same time, in the same place, shall not see it. Thus, the supposition of an *objective* presence of Christ leads us into difficulties and confusion inextricable. But suppose the promised presence of Christ is to be *subjective* —a thing seen by, and manifested to, the mind's eye— dependent, not upon the state of external objects, but upon the condition of mind and heart in the subject by whom the manifestation is to be seen; and then Christ's words are clear of all difficulty. The loving disciple sees with the eye of faith the manifestation of God and his Christ; while to the eye of ignorance and unbelief, there being no object present, and the subjective condition of

mind being unattained as yet, there is no vision, no manifestation of the Blessed One.

(*c.*) 1 *Cor.* xiv. 23.

The truth of this teaching, that the most definitely promised presence of Christ is *not objective* but *subjective*, and dependent on the mental and spiritual condition of the beholder, receives full and highly interesting confirmation from many a passage in Holy Writ. For instance, St. Paul urges the Corinthians to avoid ecstatic exhibitions of their piety, lest unbelievers, if present at such exhibitions, should think them "mad" (1 Cor. xiv. 23). He entreats the Christians of Corinth to be "perfect" in the intelligent utterance of words "with the understanding": and then, adds the apostle, if all preach in this reasonable and intelligible manner, and there come in an unbeliever, or one unacquainted with Christianity, he is convinced, his moral judgment is set at work, the secrets of his heart are brought unwontedly before his mind's eye, and so he will fall down and worship God, and "report that God is *in you* of a truth"[1] (*vide* 1 Cor. xiv. 19, 20, 24, 25).

At his first entrance the unbelieving, or the ignorant, could see nothing but the room and its Christian occupants; there was no objective presence of the Deity for him to look upon; but, as his mind opened to spiritual facts, and spiritual convictions, and spiritual wants, and to God's message in Christ for the spirit, his subjective receptivity being thus changed, he reported the manifestation of God in the Christian believers as he saw it in his own changed mind and heart.

[1] ὄντως ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι.

(*d.*) *Gal.* i. 16, *etc.*

Just so, whilst the companions of Saul were, with him, on the way to Damascus, they saw no God and heard no Christ in all the brightness and the sound of a voice; but Saul (Acts ix. 4, etc.) not only heard the distinct words of the Lord and communed with Him, but, when he came to write an account of those events (Gal. i. 16), his own description of the matter is, It pleased God "to reveal his Son *in me*."[1] Even this revelation of Christ, however accompanied by external sights and sounds which were objective enough, was not itself objective. Christ was not seen, His words were not heard (*vide* Acts xxii. 9.) by those who were with Saul; and even in the case of Saul himself, on his own direct written testimony, the revelation of Christ, the Lord's presence or manifestation, was not *to him*, but *in him*—in modern phrase, was not objective, but subjective.

From all these passages of Holy Writ we find, then, that Christ's presence—which is not exclusively or most categorically promised in connection with the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, but is generally and fully promised to two or three believers in their common prayers, and to any loving and obedient disciple—is manifested after a real and spiritual sort; is seen by the mind's eye of faith; in other words, is subjective in the mind of man, not objective in any external matter or substance.

This exposition of Scripture truth might be almost indefinitely enlarged and confirmed; but we must, in this branch of our inquiry, content ourselves with a very brief notice of only two more passages whose bearing on the subject is important.

[1] ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί.

(*e.*) *Matt.* xxviii. 16—20.

The Saviour's words to the eleven disciples, on the Galilean mountain (Matt. xxviii. 16—20), urged them to make and baptize disciples of all nations, and to teach the observance of all His commandments; and for this stupendous work, which is still so lamentably far from any adequate fulfilment, the encouragement which Jesus gave was in the words, "Lo, I am with you[1] alway,[2] even unto the end of the world [*till the conclusion of the age.*]"[3] Here is another large promise of Christ's presence, co-extensive, as we take it, with the work of gaining disciples to the Christian faith—co-extensive, such is its own declaration, with the Christian age or dispensation. During all that time, and in all such work, Jesus promises to be *with His disciples.*

How present with them? it must be asked: spiritually and subjectively, or objectively? Was it not even as St. Paul (Gal. iii. 1) reminds his converts, who had never seen Jesus in the flesh or with the bodily eye, that "before" their "eyes Jesus Christ" had "been evidently set forth[4] crucified among you [*in you*]"? Was it not in the same manner, as the same apostle (Col. i. 27) told others of his correspondents, that Christ was *in them* the hope of glory? Was it not in this spiritual and subjective manner, even "in them," and in their minds and hearts, that Christ promised to be with His preachers in all their labors, as long as the dispensation should last? There is no trace or indication that the Saviour, after the ascension, walked *objectively* with Peter, or John, or any other apostle or preacher in ancient or in modern times.

In their minds they (like St. Stephen) might see the

[1] μεθ' ὑμῶν. [2] πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας. [3] ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.
[4] προεγράφη. [5] ἐν ὑμῖν.

heavens open, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God; they might see and know that His occupation there was to intercede for them, according to the will of the Father; they knew that the sympathy of their great High Priest was with them in their every struggle and aspiration; they knew His Spirit was ever with them as their guide, their comforter, their exhorter;[1] thus, not corporeally or objectively, but spiritually and subjectively, they knew Jesus was with them and in them, and so was fulfilling the promises to common prayer and loving obedience and life-long efforts to convert all nations. In these circumstances, as well as at the Table of the Lord, the generally promised presence of Christ was in them and with them; but, in all circumstances alike, Christ was present, quite really and truly, only after a spiritual and subjective, not after a fleshly and objective, manner.

(*f.*) *Rev.* iii. 14—22.

If further evidence in support of all this were wanted, it might be found in the remarkable passage to be now cited as bearing on this part of our subject. In the address of Christ to the Church of Laodicea (Rev. iii. 14—22), the pride and sinfulness and peril of that body of believers are very plainly described by Him who is "the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." The Saviour counsels that Church to be zealous and repent and put on the genuine character of Christianity.

Even to this unsatisfactory Church, however, Christ says (ver. 20), "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup[2] with him, and he with Me." Is

[1] παράκλητος. [2] δειπνήσω.

it, one must ask, an *objective* door and an *objective* Christ with which we have here to do? Is it not, obviously, a *subjective* representation which is set before the Laodiceans, and (as God is no respecter of persons) before all men in positions similar to theirs? Even in the hearts of rebellious, self-conceited, careless men, who are disciples hardly in anything more than name, Christ, or Christ's Spirit (ver. 22), seeks to awaken repentance and offers His true riches.

To this extent Christ is present *in and with* the minds even of wicked and backsliding Christians. If they will repent, listen to His exhortations and warnings, soften their hearts, humble themselves, awake to spiritual realities, then they will feel His presence more. That presence will be a delight and a joy, a sweet and familiar companionship to them. It will be no longer as a loving and neglected watchman who warns them against dangers, but as a welcome and beloved friend, that Christ will "sup with them, and they with Him." Thus, even with the wicked He is present, but it is as one standing in the intellect, as it were, outside the heart, and asking for admission. With the repentant and obedient He is still present, but it is as one whose delighted and delightsome Spirit permeates the whole heart and soul and intelligence of the man who has opened to him.

This (Rev. iii. 22) is part of "what *the Spirit* saith to the Churches"; and so there is no room for the question here, whether it is Christ bodily and objectively, or Christ spiritually and subjectively, who says, "I stand at the door and knock." In the minds even of the indifferent and haughty Laodicean Christians—and if in theirs, surely in every Christian mind, however proud, cold, and culpable—Christ is present and is active with admoni-

tion, counsel, and entreaty. In the same mind, let us ask, when its mood is changed by repentance and renewed zeal. is Christ *more present?* Can a being, divine or human, or both, be, *objectively*, *more or less* present in one and the same time and place? Must he not be, *objectively*, either present or absent? But here, in the case of the Laodiceans, He is present as one standing and waiting *outside* the unrepentant heart, and as one admitted *inside* the same heart when it repents.

What is this but to say that, throughout, Christ for His part is present—divinely present, infinitely present, equally present—with the Christian, whether that Christian welcomes Him or not; there is no variation in the degree or measure of Christ's presence, unless indeed the man can make himself to be, at last, utterly rejected, —otherwise, Christ is present with him in all His divine fullness; and the only variation is, *subjectively*, in the man himself? He either realizes or he ignores the presence of the Lord. He either repels or he welcomes Christ. He either grieves the Spirit or he gladly yields to the Spirit's gracious suggestions. He either keeps Christ standing and knocking without, or he opens the door and admits Christ as his revered though familiar guest.

It is not a little remarkable that this demonstrably subjective presence of Christ, varying wholly and only with the variations of the man's mind, should be compared to a "*supping*" with the man, and the man with Christ. Whatever degree of divine and providential intervention any reader may recognize in the composition of Scripture, or even if such intervention be denied altogether, it is a noteworthy fact that whereas the presence of Christ, as we have seen, is far from being exclusively

promised in connection with the communion of the Lord's Supper; and whereas such undoubted presence depends, for its guarantee and assurance, upon what is implied in the nature of "communion," and upon the general promises that Christ will be present with those who pray, with those who lovingly keep His word, with those who strive to win souls to Him, and even with those who, in their self-deception, deeply need His admonition,—one of the most distinct and emphatic promises of that presence of our Lord is given to Christians living an unworthy and deplorable life; and the very presence of Christ, *supping with them*, is assured to those Christians, not on condition of their breaking bread and drinking wine in remembrance of Christ, but on condition of their opening their hearts to the Lord's entreaties that they will "be zealous and repent."

The teaching of Holy Writ is, not that Jesus is in the bread and wine, independently of the communicant's mind and heart; but, on the contrary, our supping with the Lord, and He with us, depends on wholly different conditions. Our supping with Christ, and He with us, rests on this sure and certain ground that, for believers, He is in them and abideth in them. If they grieve Him, by pride and self-conceit and other wrong-doing, still He loves them and rebukes them and chastens them (Rev. iii. 19)—this is His standing at the door and knocking; but, if they desist from their evil ways and turn to righteousness again—this is their "hearing His voice and opening to Him"—He, who has never left them nor forsaken them, will then, whether in the breaking of bread at the Lord's Table or in any other act of Christian life and duty, sup with them and they with Him.

Truly, Christ's presence with us, even His *supping*

with us, is not tied to any rite, however solemn—not even to the usages of the communion at the Lord's Table. His presence can be procured and assured to us by no outward and material object. It depends, according to his own promises, on our state of mind and heart.

But now let us, in connection with this remarkable passage of Scripture, test the doctrine of Christ's objective presence in the bread and wine, independently of the recipient's condition of mind, by one more criterion. Let it be supposed for a moment that, in the elements of the Supper, Christ is objectively though indescribably present, and that so He gives Himself to be eaten, and His blood to be partaken of, by the communicants.

On this supposition, what must have been the words addressed to the Laodiceans? Must they not have been to this effect? I wait in the broken bread and in the cup of blessing. If any man hearken to My words, and be zealous and repent, he shall open his mouth; and, in the bread he eats and in the wine he drinks, I will be present, and he shall sup, not *with* me, but *on* me?

If an objective presence of Christ in the elements had been intended to be taught by our Saviour and the writers of the New Testament, such a promise as that given to the Laodiceans would have been impossible. How could Jesus be at once objective food in the Supper of His disciples, and, at the same time, a guest partaking of that Supper with the same disciples? If we should be told that there are two Suppers of the Lord, one in which He gives His flesh and blood objectively as food, and another in which He is present subjectively as a guest supping with His followers, then the reply is obvious, namely,—that in the institution of the Lord's Supper, at all events, Jesus contemplated, as we have seen, drinking the cup

with His people (*vide* Matt. xxvi. 29, Mark xiv. 25, Luke xxii. 18); and so the alternative is forced upon us—either Jesus contemplated drinking, with His disciples, His own objective blood, or He spoke of His presence at the Supper, at every Lord's Supper, as subjective, in the mind of the believer, and not as objective, in the elements independently of the believer's mind.

The former of these alternatives is too repulsive—too near profanity—to be dealt with in detail, held in reality, or grappled with at close quarters. And thus, again, in the absence of any trace of Scripture proof for the strange doctrine of an objective presence of Christ in the bread and wine of the Supper, independently of the recipient's spirit—in face of all Scripture references to the Lord's Supper, and its institution and its usage, witnessing against an objective presence as strongly as they witness for a subjective presence—we are necessarily led to the conclusion that, while Christ's command binds us to celebrate the Lord's Supper; while doubtless grace, even the infinite and manifoldly effective grace of His divine presence, is given to this as to each act of obedience to His word; yet this presence of Christ is so entirely subjective and contingent upon the recipient's spirit or state of mind and heart, that, if there be a contentious spirit in the recipient, or any other unfitting condition of soul, the bread and wine, though partaken after most solemn blessing and giving of thanks, are to such a recipient, as St. Paul taught the Corinthians, not a Supper of the Lord at all.

§ 7. *Other Scriptures connected with our Subject.*

We now proceed to notice two passages of Holy Writ which require attention, because of their more or less di-

rect and immediate connection with our subject. The first is an episode in the narrative of St. Paul's shipwreck.

(*a.*) *Acts* xxvii. 35.

Some fourteen days had the apostle and his fellow-voyagers passed in anxiety and hunger. Thereupon, encouraged by the vision he had received, St. Paul exhorts them to "take some food."[1] "And, when he had thus spoken," the history proceeds (Acts xxvii. 35, 36), "he took bread, and gave thanks[2] to God in presence of them all: and when he had broken it, he began to eat. Then were they all of good cheer, and they also took some food."

The phraseology of this narrative is strikingly like that which had already, when St. Paul thus acted, become habitual, and well-nigh technical, as appertaining to the Lord's Supper among Christians. There is the "took bread," the "giving thanks" to God for it, the "breaking," the "eating." There is even a parallel to the Christian "gladness" and "fellowship," for St. Paul's companions became "of good cheer," and they also partook of food.

Can we think that St. Paul had in his mind no recollection of the Lord's Supper and its declaring the death of Christ at this solemn time of peril in shipwreck? Can we think he intended no reference to the blessed Supper for those companions who might, even during the voyage, have become capable of appreciating its consolation, susceptible of its holy encouragement? Must we not think that, with however much or little comprehension on the

[1] τροφῆς. "Meat," it should be remembered, was old English for food generally, not for flesh in particular, as now.

[2] εὐχαρίστησε—he *eucharized*, or gave thanks for the bread. This Greek verb *eucharize* is, of course, derivatively akin to the noun "*eucharist*," a thanksgiving.

part of the different beholders, St. Paul was here commemorating the dying love of Christ?

On either of the suppositions suggested by these questions, it is noticeable how, in the apostolic age, the most common life, the most secular circumstances, were colored by the "breaking of bread" and by the "communion" with Christ and with one's fellow-men. Ordinary life was so much of a communion and a Lord's Supper—the communion of the Lord's Supper was so entirely a part of every-day Christian life—that they were blended and became hard to be distinguished. So holy and joyful was the Christian life; so simple and unceremonial was the communion of the Lord's Supper.

Surely this intermixture of the commemorative Supper with common life has its lesson for those of us who, in the present day, are disposed to draw very strongly marked lines between the Lord's Supper and every other portion of Christian life or worship.

(*b.*) 1 *Cor.* xiv. 16, etc.

The other passage, to which attention should not fail to be directed, occurs in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians (xiv. 16). The context treats of the greater usefulness of intelligible speech—preaching, praying, or singing, in words that can be understood—as contrasted with the ecstatic but unintelligible utterances of those who had the gift of "tongues." In this connection the apostle writes, "When thou shalt bless with the Spirit" (that is, in the unintelligible utterance of "tongues"), "how shall he that occupieth the room of the uninitiated[1] say the Amen at thy Eucharist, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?"

[1] ἰδιώτης, not "unlearned" generally, but unacquainted with any particular subject under notice.

This text, by reason of the "blessing" named in it, and the "Eucharist" (or giving of thanks), which were both familiar phrases constantly employed by the primitive Christians in connection with the Lord's Supper, is generally interpreted as referring to the breaking of bread. St. Paul's mention of "*the Amen*" is regarded as confirming this interpretation, inasmuch as "the Amen" of the congregation, in its assent to the eucharistic blessing, became a marked and famous characteristic of the Lord's Supper in early Christian days.

Assuming, then, as may fairly be assumed, that St. Paul's reference in this text is to the Lord's Supper, we derive from this passage several important lessons. Besides the terms "Lord's Supper," "Communion," "Breaking of Bread," we are here furnished with another designation, "Eucharist" (or "giving of thanks"), for the same holy rite; and, like each of the other designations, this of Eucharist is assuredly full of appropriateness, and rich in suggestive significance. Well may the rite, in which we commemorate Christ's redemptive death, be a Eucharist full of thanksgiving.

But notice, again, that St. Paul here teaches us the inferiority of even miraculously bestowed gifts of unintelligible "tongues," as compared with plain words, in the eucharistic service, such as could be "understanded of the people." Is there no useful instruction in this verse for those who retain a Latin service amongst congregations unacquainted with the Latin language? Nay, for any of us who turn our backs on the congregation, and so make it more difficult for our fellow-worshippers to hear our words and take part in the worship with the understanding, is there not in this text a needful word of admonition? And does not this apostolic warning apply,

with still greater force, to those amongst us who, conceiving themselves to be acting vicariously for the people in the Eucharist, deem it permissible, if not desirable, that the voice of the officiating minister should, in certain parts of the Eucharist at all events, be dropped so low as to become a whisper scarcely audible by the congregation?

These questions can hardly fail to elicit a right answer from any thoughtful reader of the verse we have been examining; and that answer will assuredly be in keeping with the apostle's general maxim on the same subject (1 Cor. xiv. 19), "In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may teach others also, than ten thousand words in an [unknown] tongue."

Then there is still another lesson derivable from this passage. Soon after the words immediately under consideration, St. Paul (ver. 23) proceeds, "If therefore the whole congregation [*ecclesia*, the assembly or church] be come together into one place, and all speak with [unintelligible] tongues, and there come in those that are uninitiated, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?"

In these words the apostle indicates that the Christian assembly, in his time, was open to the visits of unbelievers as well as of those believers who were as yet but slightly, if at all, initiated into the deeper truths and higher aspirations of Christ's religion. And for these visitors, whether they might be partially acquainted with the Gospel and already almost persuaded to be Christians, or whether they might be only curious and inquisitive unbelievers, St. Paul enjoined that the general usages of the congregation, and especially the observances in the breaking of bread, should be open without reserve, and so intelligible as to appeal to the understanding of all—

"edify" (ver. 17) the minds of the uninformed and convince the judgment of the most sceptical.

This does not look like encouragement, on the part of the apostle, of any esoteric teaching for the select few, to the exclusion of the masses. Exoteric teaching for the multitude, and esoteric doctrine for the minority, was the practice of some heathen philosophers, and may have been the delight and the safeguard of priestly confraternities in all ages; but they are diametrically opposed to apostolic usage, which appeals to the reason and the understanding of all men; which, so far as hearers can bear and comprehend the truth, is all anxiety to make that truth known, even to the utmost bounds of what the Father has divulged. Light not darkness, revelation not obscurity, the intelligible not the bewildering, are the aim and object of Christ's teaching and of apostolic exhortation, alike in ordinary worship and in the special ministering of the Eucharist.

The importance and usefulness of this Pauline instruction will become especially apparent when we enter upon an examination of certain opinions and practices of later Church history. Meanwhile, this passage teaches us that, in all parts of Christian worship, our language ought to be simple and intelligible; our appeal should be to the heart through the intellect; we should address ourselves, not to the initiated only, but also to the unenlightened and the unbelieving.

§ 8. *Scripture Light on the Attempt to set the Lord's Supper above all other Acts of Christian Life or Worship.*

An attempt is sometimes made to exalt the communion of the Lord's Supper into the position of the highest act

of religious worship, as an observance that more than any other brings the Christian into the very presence of God and the Saviour.

It would be most remote from our wish to do anything that might detract from the true beauty and glory of the Eucharist. But, on the other hand, no injury is ultimately and really more damaging, in any case, than undue and false glorifying, which is sure to be followed by a reaction of excessive depreciation. Already there are not wanting signs of such a reaction with reference to the ritualistic exaltation of the Lord's Supper.

We have seen that, at the institution of the Eucharist, Christ certainly did not say of the wine, "This is My blood," but He did say, "This is the new covenant in My blood"; and similarly, beyond all reasonable doubt, Christ did not say of the bread, "This is My body," but He did say, "This is the new covenant ratified by My body, which is being given for you."

And, yet again, in the great discourse at Capernaum (John vi.), Christ did not speak with any reference to the Eucharist, or its bread and wine; but He Himself did definitely teach (ver. 35) that coming to Him as a disciple was eating His flesh, and belief in Him was drinking His blood, in the sense of that discourse.

And this line of reflection will be further illustrated and enforced by the remembrance that, so far as the presence of God and of our Lord is concerned, that highest privilege and blessing is promised more definitely to the common prayer of believers, or to general fidelity and obedience to Christ's commands, or to labors for the extension of Christ's kingdom, than to the practice of the breaking of bread. Indeed, the greatest assurance of the divine presence with us in the Eucharist rests on the fact

that that service is an act of common prayer and praise, is an act of obedience to Christ, is an attempt to declare, by act as well as word, the death of the Lord till His coming again.

Thus far then, if such comparisons must be instituted, the Lord's Supper depends for its highest glory in Christ's presence, not on its own inherent character and the promises connected with itself, but on the fact that such divine presence is promised to prayer, obedience, and preaching; and, to this extent and in this manner, the blessed Eucharist cannot truly be described as superior to common prayer, holier than general obedience, or more assured of Christ's presence and co-operation than such preaching by a disciple as strives to teach the observance of all our Lord's commands.

If, again, we measure the dignity of the Lord's Supper by the dangers attaching to unworthy participation, they are terrible indeed, and they bespeak its high dignity and importance; but they cannot exceed the tremendous peril of unworthy hearing of the Gospel such as makes the Christian preacher "a savour of death unto death" "in them that perish" (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16); they cannot exceed the "certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation" which attaches to all wilful sinning after that we have received the knowledge of the truth (Heb. x. 26, 27); neither can they surpass, in terribleness, the results of falling away on the part of "those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good Word of God, and the powers of the world to come." (Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6.)

Measured by this standard, the vast religious importance of the Eucharist is seen not to surpass that of the ordi-

nance of preaching or of general compliance with Christ's precepts of righteousness and holiness.

Some Christian writers have ingeniously, and with no slight argumentative force, contrasted the few and brief references to the Eucharist in the New Testament with the comparatively abundant and copious insistance, in its pages, on the duties of obedience and prayer, and on the practice of Christian teaching and exhortation: and from this line of observation the inference has been legitimately enough drawn that, holy and beautiful as the Eucharist is made to appear in the few passages of Holy Writ in which reference is made to it, still it cannot surpass in dignity or importance those other topics and observances which fill every page of the Christian Scriptures.

§ 9. *The Lord's Prayer and the Lord's Supper in respect of their Direct and Unaltered Descent to us from Christ.*

The assertion is sometimes made that the Holy Communion is the only part of Christian worship which has come down to us direct and unaltered from the very hands of Christ.

That the blessed sacrament, with various additions and alterations, has come down to us from our Saviour, is most true: and we glory in this truth as affording us an unbroken chain of historical connection and evidence between the table where the Lord presided in an upper chamber at Jerusalem and our present practice. To go beyond this, however, and allege that the modern celebration derives sanctity from its unaltered imitation of our Lord's Supper, or of the apostolic rite, is to ignore the facts of history, and to set one's self in opposition to plain and unmistakable truth.

If we want a part of Christian worship which has come to us direct and unaltered from our Lord, and if the so-called "central act" of Christian worship is to be characterized by this mark, it must not be sought in the sacrament of Communion, but in the form and model of prayer (without the final ascription) as taught us by our Lord, and as handed down by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

We point to this unquestionable truth from no wish to detract from the honor due to the Lord's Supper, but with a desire to give that rite its due place in the economy of grace, while we exalt the Lord's Prayer to its unique and unrivalled pre-eminence in the same system.

§ 10. *Scripture Usage as to "the Body of Christ."*

We close this part of our investigation with the remark that, whereas it is in the highest degree improbable, as has been seen, that our blessed Lord ever called the eucharistic wine His blood, or the eucharistic bread His body, there is something else which apostolic usage constantly designated as the body of Christ. If we look at St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, for instance, we find the apostle writing (Col. i. 18), "He [Christ] is the head of the body, the Church": and (Col. i. 24), I "now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind[1] of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church": or, passing by other similar expressions in the same epistle, and passing also several instances of the same usage in the Epistle to the Ephesians, let us notice that which occurs in the fifth chapter of that epistle (Eph. v. 30). Through several preceding verses St. Paul has been insisting on the obedience and love which the Church should exercise towards Christ,

[1] τὰ ὑστερήματα, that which is lacking.

who is her husband and her head. Then follow the words, "For we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones."

Here is, indeed, transubstantiation and incorporation of believers into Christ. By Christ giving Himself (ver. 25) for the Church, and by that Church being sanctified and cleansed so as to be a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish (verses 26, 27)—thus are accomplished the union and incorporation of the Church with Christ.

If now we turn to the earliest of St. Paul's extant Epistles to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13), we find these words, "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." After following up this instruction for a while, the apostle summarizes it thus (ver. 27): "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."

The same epistle furnishes us with yet another illustration of this usage which, though, like the preceding, it has been dealt with already in this essay in some of its bearings, cannot now be omitted from this concluding line of thought.

The apostle writes (1 Cor. x. 16, 17), "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? For we, the multitude, are one bread, one body: for we all take part out of the one bread."

In this last passage not only are the multitude of believers declared to be the one body of Christ, but the bread of the Eucharist, which is also named, is defined as, not the body of Christ, but as *a* communion (not

"*the*" communion, as the English version renders it), *a* means of fellowship, one of several means, like faith, or baptism, or prayer, or co-operation in works for the saving of souls—one of several such means for ingrafting and incorporating men into the body of Christ.

St. Paul might have been contemplating the errors and disputes of coming ages, when he so frequently teaches, throughout his letters, that men, believing men, are the body of Christ, and His flesh; or when he insists that there must be no confusion—there must be most distinct discernment—between the bread in the Eucharist and the body which is Christ and His people in all their multitude; or when He lays down this distinction between us who are the body of Christ and the bread which, worthily received, is a communion or means of participation in that body which is Christ and His people.

§ 11. *Conclusion.*

Thus consistently does Holy Writ avoid giving encouragement to the idea of an objective presence of Christ in the elements of the Lord's Supper.

We have looked to metaphors whose usage preceded and followed the institution of the Eucharist; we have carefully studied the records of the institution of the Lord's Supper; we have diligently examined the practice of the New Testament writers on this subject: and everywhere, without exception, we have found irrefragable proofs that the presence of Christ at the Eucharist, as on all other occasions since the Ascension, is subjective, by His Spirit, in men's minds and hearts; and however prayer, or self-denying work, or a book, or a discourse, or the breaking of bread, may either of them be the instrument and means, with God's blessing, for ingrafting a

soul into Christ and Christ into that soul, still it is part of our allegiance to truth—it is our solemn and bounden duty—on pain of being unworthy and bringing judgment on ourselves, to distinguish between the means of grace and the grace itself, between the material and the spiritual, between the objective bread and the objective wine, on the one hand, and the subjective and most real presence of Christ by His Spirit on the other hand. Assuredly, on this subject, if on any, there is wisdom and piety in yielding ourselves to the guidance and instruction of the Saviour and His apostles as those can be found, in their pristine purity and simplicity, only in the writings of the New Testament.

BOOK II.

POST-APOSTOLIC USES OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

From the Scripture record concerning the institution and usage of the Lord's Supper, we pass now to a consideration of the manner in which that simple rite of Christian communion was dealt with in the ages that intervened betwixt the apostles and the Reformation.

CHAPTER I.

PLINY'S MENTION OF THE CHRISTIAN "SACRAMENT."

On this point some little information may possibly be derived from the famous letter of Pliny the Younger to the Emperor Trajan. The date of this letter is quite early in the second century, within a few years of the death of the last of the apostles. Pliny, as is well known, was governor of a Roman province in what we now call Asia Minor. Under those circumstances he addressed the following inquiry to his imperial master (Pliny's Letters, Book x. let. 97):—

"It is my custom, sire, to refer to you all points concerning which I am in doubt; for who can better guide

my hesitancy or inform my ignorance? Having never been present at the trials of Christians, I know not in what manner, or to what extent, they are wont to be punished or examined. Indeed, I have no slight doubt whether there ought not to be different modes of procedure in dealing with those of different ages, with the delicate and with the more robust; whether pardon should not be extended to those who retract, or whether, in the case of one who has ever been a Christian, his having desisted should be of no avail; and whether punishment should attach to the very profession of Christianity apart from any crime, or whether it should be inflicted by reason of crimes that may co-exist with such a profession.

"Meanwhile, this has been my mode of dealing with those who were accused before me of being Christians. I asked them the question, Were they Christians? If they confessed, I repeated the question once and again, accompanying it with a threat of punishment. Those who persisted I ordered away to execution. For I entertained no doubt, whatever that might be to which they confessed, that, assuredly, pertinacious and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished.

"There were others of like foolishness, whose cases I set down for trial at Rome, inasmuch as they were Roman citizens.

"Ere long, the accusations were multiplied by reason of our dealing with them, as one generally finds, and fresh cases were brought under my notice, not only in greater numbers, but marked by new characteristics. There was published an anonymous writing which contained the names of many persons who deny that they either are or ever were Christians. When these, follow-

ing my example, called upon the gods; offered prayers, with incense and wine, to your image which, for this very purpose, I had ordered to be set in the midst of the statues of the deities; and when, moreover, they reviled Christ—actions to whose performance, it is said, real Christians can by no possible means be constrained—I thought they should be discharged.

"Others, who were named in the list, acknowledged themselves Christians. Presently, however, they denied it, saying it was true they had been Christians, but they had ceased to be so—some three years previously, some several years since, some few even so long as twenty years ago. All these also worshipped your image and the statues of the gods and reviled Christ; and, moreover, they affirmed that the sum of their error or offense, whichever it might have been, had consisted in this:—that on a set day, before dawn, they were wont to assemble and repeat, in alternate parts, a chant to Christ as God; that they then bound themselves by an oath [*sacramento*] not to commit any crime, but to abstain from robbery, theft, or adultery; to avoid every breach of faith; and never to refuse, when called upon, to restore a deposit which had been entrusted to them: and, when these rites had been performed, it was their custom to disperse, and then again to assemble for the purpose of partaking in common a meal of an entirely harmless nature. This last practice, however, they had abandoned after the issuing of my edict in which, according to your commands, I had forbidden the assembling of popular confraternities [*hetærias*].

"And for these reasons I deemed it the more necessary to ascertain, even by means of torture, what might be the truth, in these matters, from two young women who bore

the official name of deaconesses [*ministræ*] among the Christians. I found by this means, however, nothing but a perverted and extravagant superstition: and therefore I postponed further inquiry till I might avail myself of thy counsel. For it seemed to me a matter worthy of reference to thee, especially because of the number of those who were in danger of being accused as Christians: for many persons, of every age, of every rank, and of both sexes, are already imperilled and will be so. Nor is it only in towns, but even in villages and in rural districts, that the contagion of this superstition has taken effect; and yet it seems not impossible that the mischief may be stayed and set right. One fact at all events is quite clear, namely, that the temples, which were almost deserted, begin to be once more attended, and the accustomed sacrifices, after long disuse, are being resumed: everywhere victims are being sold for which, till quite lately, scarce any purchaser was to be found. And from this it is easy to infer what a vast number of people can be won back if opportunity for retracting be afforded them."

In this letter of the unbelieving but acute and philosophical Roman ruler, there are many points on which one is tempted to dwell; but we must pass by the too notorious cruelty of Roman law, the wide extent to which Christianity had prevailed in a few years, the testimony of Pliny that it had gained a footing in his province twenty or five and twenty years before the date of his letter, the harmlessness and yet the often unlimited zeal which was found in the Christians, the existence of deaconesses in that early Church, the falling away of some Christians under persecution, the faithfulness even unto torture and death of others, the fact that believers

were found not only among the poor and miserable but in every rank, and even among those who, as Roman citizens, were persons of sufficient influence and importance to have their cases remitted on appeal to Rome—these and other points, especially the utter unfriendliness and scorn of Pliny, from whom this eulogy of our religion is nevertheless extorted by truth and justice alone,—all these points must be passed by us without further notice, in order that we may fix our attention on Pliny's description of certain particulars in the Christian life and worship of those very early times.

And here we notice that the assembling of the Christians took place "on a set day" (*stato die*), doubtless on the first day of the week, the Lord's Day, of the New Testament writers—the Day of the Sun, as we shall presently find it called by an early Christian author. On this "set day" it had been the practice of the Christians formerly to hold two assemblies—one at a very early hour in the morning; the other, apparently from its exciting Roman jealousy as partaking of the nature of a suspected association, at a late hour, when night was approaching. The early meeting was characterized by the addressing of a chant to Christ as God.

Thus, we have important testimony from Pliny to the primitive belief in our Saviour's divine nature, and to the prevalence of worship addressed to Him as one with the Christian God. An interesting feature in this ancient chant of the Church is its having been sung *alternately* by some two portions of the assembly. Is not this indicative of such a practice, as we find in the oldest extant Liturgies, of the minister and the flock responding to one another in the words:—

Minister. The Lord be with you.
People. And with thy spirit.
M. Lift up your hearts.
P. We lift them up unto the Lord.
M. Let us give thanks unto the Lord.
P. It is meet and right so to do.
M. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

Supplications and responses like these, together with longer prayers to which the congregation responded with the Amen, are found in the still extant Liturgies, which, coming to us from the fourth or fifth century, bear the names of St. James, St. Mark, and other venerable men. Such responsive litanies and prayers must, in their origin, have been older than those ancient Liturgies, which all contain them; and it is highly probable that they are the echoes of the chant raised, with some kind of alternation, in the Church described by Pliny.

It is very interesting to notice that the musical intonation given to those primitive devotions addressed to Christ, or, at least, the music which was mingled with the prayers and praises, led the Roman governor to call the service, in great part, if not wholly, "the singing of a chant[1] to Christ."

And next we have to notice, in Pliny's representation of Christian worship, his mention of an oath (*sacramentum* in the Latin) by which, he says, the Christians bound themselves. Pliny's description of this *oath* strikes us as very strange and remarkable. Neither in Scripture, nor in the post-apostolic writings, do we find anything like this oath in any ancient delineation of Christian worship.[2]

[1] *Carmenque* Christo quasi Deo *dicere* secum invicem.

[2] There is no probability of the baptismal vow having been thus repeated every week.

It is represented as an oath against wrong-doing, robbery, theft, adultery, breach of faith, and abuse of trust.

If we could suppose that the decalogue was recited in the Liturgy of that very early age, somewhat as it is rehearsed now in the Communion Service of the English Church, we might understand some of the characteristics of this oath: but, then, the introduction of the Ten Commandments into the English Liturgy originated in the sixteenth century, and no direct ancient precedent for this custom is known to us, apart from the letter of Pliny which we are considering.

The Roman governor had evidently taken no little pains to discover as much truth as he could in connection with Christianity. He obviously wished to lay before the emperor as clear an account as possible of all the important facts he had discovered. Irrelevant matter, mere mistaken fancies, something entirely alien from the explanations afforded him by the Christians—such idle representations were not likely to proceed from Pliny, least of all when he troubled a master like Trajan with facts that were to be considered. Careless inaccuracy in such a case would bring disgrace upon the governor if it were detected by the emperor. We may be sure there was something real which led Pliny to name this oath and the details he connects with it.

What was there in the religion of the earliest Christians which might give rise to this part of Pliny's description? In trying to answer this question, we must bear in mind that the evidence, upon which the description is based, was in part at least extracted by torture from two unhappy deaconesses.

If now we image to ourselves the kind of examination by question and answer implied in this horrid process, it

will yield as its most probable results just such testimony as that which Pliny submitted to Trajan.

It is natural to suppose that, without the intervention of interpreters or translators, the unfortunate deaconesses would themselves employ the Latin language in which their wretched jailers would interrogate them amidst their terror and their agony.

What, they would be asked, is done by you at the early meeting of the Christians?

We chant a service to Christ as our God, they would reply.

What else? the jailers would demand.

We join in a sacred vow ("*sacrament*," as they would call it in Latin, and as we, people of Western Europe, have learned to call the same holy rite.)

To the torturers, this term "sacrament" would not bear the signification it most readily conveys to our minds. To Trajan's contemporaries a "sacrament" suggested *an oath;* and one is obliged to realize to one's self the interest which this word would kindle in the minds of those who were trying to extort from the deaconesses some secret and unacknowledged deeds of evil. "An oath," the torturers would think: yes, now we are coming to the pith and kernel of this hateful superstition. It has seemed harmless enough hitherto; but that, which is done by the Christians in secret, we have never yet elicited. Now we shall discover it. They bind one another by a sacrament, an oath! Well, tell us now the nature of this your secret oath. To what mischief, to what crime, do you pledge yourselves by this oath?

To none, would be the reply of the poor woman; and, as Rome's hideous scourge, with its knots of metal, fell upon them, still they would persist in their testimony

that the Christian sacrament bound them to no evil deed.[1]

What! do you conspire for no robbery, no theft?

For none, would be their cry; and so this negative, too, finds its place in the record of their examination, as does, presently after, their denial of any violation of the laws of chastity.[2]

The Roman record of the next portion of their confession represents them as saying their sacrament was a pledge against any breach of faith,[3] and against the unjust retaining of anything which had been entrusted to their custody.[4]

These last two particulars seem out of keeping with such an examination under torture—out of keeping with the questions likely to be asked from Christian women at such a time. The natural interpretation of this part of the case we take to be that the torturers, weary and disappointed at discovering no heinous crime connected with the Christian oath, changed the form of their interrogatories at this point.

You deny all crimes as the burden of your Christian "sacrament," they would say; to what then are you bound by this oath of yours?

To such a query the unhappy victims might well reply, Our oath binds us never to deny our faith, never to be false to our religion.

One perceives at once how easily an expression like this, most common among Christians, would be misapprehended by Pliny or his subalterns, as if it were intended for the ordinary Latin phrase which referred,

[1] Non in scelus aliquod.
[2] Ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent.
[3] Ne fidem fallerent.
[4] Ne depositum appellati abnegarent.

idiomatically, to breach of faith in general. The deaconesses spoke of the sacrament as pledging them not to break faith with Christ. They were understood to mean that they took an oath against unfaithfulness in general. There is an ineptitude in the latter vow, whereas the former is most appropriate. For Christians to take an oath that they would keep faith generally, looks like a platitude, making much ado about what would be with them a matter of course; but to swear fidelity to Christ as the Captain of their salvation—to take, as it were, a military oath of fidelity and obedience to Jesus—was just the special mark and characteristic of a believer.

So do we understand this part of the representation of the Christian "sacrament": and, similarly, the next expression in Pliny's letter makes the Christians bind themselves by oath to restore honestly, when called upon to do so, whatever might have been entrusted to their custody. What a strange and improbable narrowness this gives to the delineation of Christian character! Suppose, however, that the deaconesses went on to say their "sacrament" pledged them faithfully to keep and guard that good thing—as was St. Paul's expression (1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 20)—which had been committed unto them. To the unbelieving Romans this Scriptural and almost technical phrase would be obscure and unintelligible, and nothing could be more likely than that Pliny, or those acting under his order, would misunderstand the Christian oath as pledging Christ's followers to be faithful in the capacity of trustees and custodians of property in general, instead of binding them to be faithful guardians of the deposit of truth and hope and love committed unto them in the Gospel of Christ.

Thus do we follow, step by step, along the confession

extorted from the two deaconesses. So do they tell us of a sacred vow ("*sacrament*" or oath) by which their co-religionists were wont to bind themselves at the early gathering of the Lord's Day morning. It was an oath, not binding them to any crime, theft, adultery, or the like, but to fidelity towards their Captain, Christ, and to inviolable constancy in guarding the good thing committed to their trust by Christ.

Here, then, we have a fresh name, "Sacrament," added to the list of appellations for the Eucharist, and this is done in the decade immediately following the age of the apostles.

Nothing can be more probable than that the Lord's Supper had, by some of the apostles themselves, been called an oath, as is the signification of this Latin word "Sacrament."

So far as we can trust Pliny's description of the most salient points in the religion of the early Christians—and his character and position and obvious painstaking in the matter combine with the whole spirit of his delineation to assure one of its trustworthiness—we have here, not only a fresh name for the Christian "breaking of bread," a name which has been perpetuated and sanctioned by all subsequent usage in the Church of the West, but in the very name we have testimony to the effect that, whatever else the communion of the Lord's Supper might be to Christians, one most impressive characteristic of it, as it appeared to the minds of the Latin-speaking peoples, was as the military oath of courage, obedience, and fidelity to Christ and His Gospel.

Pliny fails to make mention of any outward badges, symbols, and tokens connected with the sacrament. To him that which was, before all things, conspicuous, was

that it was an oath binding men to a course of conduct—a course of moral action, opposed to evil, and in support of faith and fidelity.

It is of no small moment that we should observe one or two other points in this part of Pliny's letter. He records that, in the earlier period of his rule in Bithynia, it had been the custom of the Christians to assemble a second time, late in the day, for the purpose of partaking of a harmless meal[1] in common. This was, manifestly, the Supper, in accordance with apostolic usage, as an evening meal, in the course of which was celebrated the eucharistic breaking of bread and drinking of the cup. This later assembling of the Christians had been abandoned, however, in compliance with the command of the emperor and his representative.

It is difficult to imagine that the Bithynian Christians would give up their eucharistic breaking of bread at the same time that they, from political considerations, desisted from the evening meal that had hitherto accompanied it; and thus we find confirmation of our belief that the sacrament of the early morning was, as we have been observing, a celebration of the Eucharist: and, if this be so, we have an instance, probably one of the very earliest instances, of the Lord's Supper being made, no longer part of a meal in common, but a sacrament, with breaking of bread and drinking of the cup only, in the morning ere yet day had well dawned. In later times (for example, in the days of Tertullian) the evening meal of Christians had again come into vogue; but under the rule of Pliny it was, at least for a time, abandoned; and, in obedience to the State, that Church of confessors and martyrs changed even apostolic customs in matters of

[1] Ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium.

such small moment as whether the communion was in the morning or the evening, whether it was conjoined with the meal in common, or dissociated from it.

It is fair to say that, though Pliny calls Christianity a "perverted and over-zealous superstition," he gives no facts or proofs which would justify any one in calling the religion of Christ a superstition in the modern sense of that word. We leave those, whose convictions differ from our own, to imagine what Pliny must have written to Trajan, on this aspect of the case, if he had found the Christians in his province believing and teaching that bread and wine, after eucharistic blessing, remained, indeed; to all appearance still bread and wine, but were, in some imperceptible, indescribable, and inconceivable manner, changed into the objective flesh and blood of Christ, whose material body was, nevertheless, described as being in heaven and absent from earth at the same time that it was thus objectively present in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper.

As wide as the poles asunder, however, is Pliny's representation of the Christian sacrament as an oath from this idea of an objective presence of an absent object.

CHAPTER II.

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN WRITINGS WITH REFERENCE TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

FROM this heathen representation of the Christian sacrament about the year 110 A. D., we proceed to notice the teaching of certain ancient Christian writers on the same subject. In this connection, of course, the volume of evidence that might be adduced is immense. Apart from any independent investigations that might be instituted, Dr. Pusey and his allies would furnish us with a copious "Catena Patrum" on the one side; while, on the other side, the late Dean Goode, Dr. Harrison,[1] and those who agree with them, would present the same links in the chain of evidence (and other added links, too) in quite a different light.

Results of somewhat similar divergence would be obtained if we yielded ourselves, on the one side, to the teaching of Daillé's well-known old book on "The Right Use of the Fathers," or to the guidance, on the other side, of the late Professor Blunt.

Instead of attempting to produce many brief quotations concerning the Eucharist from Ignatius or Polycarp, or from other writers of questionable authenticity, we shall endeavor to set before the reader one very complete picture of the Lord's Supper as it was practised in the early

[1] John Harrison, D.D. Edin., Vicar of Fenwick, near Doncaster, author of "Whose are the Fathers?" "An Answer to Dr. Pusey's Challenge," "An Answer in Seven Tracts to the Eucharistic Doctrine of Romanists and Ritualists," etc.

Church; and from this, we think, important conclusions may be drawn that will enable us to deal very briefly with the vast mass of citation that has been adduced, and still may be adduced, from the Christian writers of post-apostolic antiquity.

Before proceeding to quote from those great men whose writings, like their fame, have reached down to these modern times from the earliest centuries of the Christian era, it may be well to offer a few introductory remarks.

Apart from the testimony to any writer's power which is furnished by survival through ages, the reader who can contemplate works like those of Justin, Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Jerome, or Augustine, and yet can fail to perceive the depth and originality and force which characterize their pages, is not to be envied by us. We cannot sympathize with him. In genius, and in force of thought and expression, these ancient Christian authors appear to us, from the specimens we have read, not as pigmies, but as giants.

Contemplate their paucity of advantages, the scarcity of manuscripts, the awkward form in which those manuscripts existed, the difficulty attaching to intercourse between the scholars of those ancient days; and, in view of these obstacles to research, the learning of the early Christian writers is well-nigh as admirable as the ingenuity with which they often handle topics that were then new to the world and to themselves. To these great students and thinkers and writers, the designation "Fathers" has constantly been applied by vast numbers of those who have succeeded them; and, in respect of much of our present religious thought and nomenclature having been created by the so-called Fathers, there is an appropriateness in the title.

On the other hand, however, it should not be forgotten that there is something, in the very essence and spirit of Christ's religion, which forbids the setting up of any merely human authority as that by which the intellectual freedom of believers is to limited, or their opinions are to be prescribed and dictated. Not only is the apostolic appeal to individual judgment in such utterances as, "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say" (1 Cor. x. 15); or "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess. v. 21); or "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you" (1 Peter iii. 15); but the very chief of apostles defines the limits of his own authority in such wise as that whilst, on the one hand, neither he, nor any man, nor even an angel from heaven, may change the Gospel of Christ (Gal. i. 8), and whilst he is bound to preach that Gospel and enforce it to the very utmost of his knowledge, wisdom, and power, yet, on the other hand, it is his own emphatic and most noteworthy declaration, "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy" (2 Cor. i. 24). And all this apostolic insistency on the necessity and duty of private judgment is in perfect harmony with the teaching of our Lord—indeed, finds its authorization in words like those of the Saviour when He said, "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ" (Matt. xxiii. 8—10).

Thus distinctly, in the letter of precepts as well as in the general spirit of the New Testament, are we forbidden to constitute the writers of the post-apostolic Church as

"Fathers" in the sense of men whose opinions are to bind us with any degree of authority other than that of ordinary Christian advisers or informants. It may be wise, or it may be unwise, to call those writers "Fathers" in the sense of men who originated not a few of the terms and definitions of modern theology; but it is obviously unscriptural and wrong to yield them that venerable name with the idea that they are writers who must be obeyed rather than judged.

It is this injudicious attempt to overstrain patristic authority that has provoked, from those who dislike it, the rejoinder that the post-apostolic writers of the Church's first six centuries were not the "Fathers" but the "children" of Christendom.

It is an old fight of words, and perhaps one not likely to be settled soon, whether the early recipients of any system of teaching are *Fathers* in respect of their handing it down to their successors, or *children* inasmuch as humanity, with the accumulated experience of the intervening ages, is now older and should be wiser than it was in their time.

This vexed question we shall not attempt to decide peremptorily; but, in examining any opinions of the so-called Fathers, we must not forget that while they were men of more than ordinary mental power—while not a few of them were men of extraordinary intellectual gifts—yet their own opinions varied from period to period of their career as writers, and all their opposing variations of thought cannot be accepted as right and true. The habit of rhetorical exaggeration learned by the unbeliever, or the layman, clung to him when he became a Christian and a Churchman. The professional subtlety of the advocate, the dogmatical refinement of the metaphysician,

the fancy of the imaginative man, the stern logic of the exact and systematic thinker, the general dignity of the man of lofty mind, the occasional trifling of the wayward or the less strong-minded—all these peculiarities adhered to the several writers with whose opinions we are now concerned. We adduce their testimony and their thoughts, not as of judges to whose decision we must submit, but as the best evidence we can obtain concerning the post-apostolic doctrines and practices in connection with the Lord's Supper.

A. *Justin Martyr's Testimony.*

Probably the earliest extant passages of any length, bearing upon our subject, are to be found in the writings of Justin, the philosopher and martyr. The approximate date of Justin's genuine writings may be taken as about A. D. 150. Justin's Apology or Defence of Christianity is in two parts, which are addressed to different Roman Emperors, Antonius Pius and Marcus Aurelius. This was followed by the narrative of a Dialogue concerning Christianity between Justin and Trypho, the Jew. Justin himself was a native of Samaria, probably not of Jewish extraction. He studied in many schools of philosophy before addicting himself, as a layman, to the wisdom that is in Christ.

(*a.*) *From the Dialogue with Trypho.*

From his Dialogue with Trypho (pp. 344, 345 of the Paris edition), we cite the following words:—

"The true priestly race of God are we, as God also Himself witnesseth when He saith that in every place among the Gentiles men bring sacrifices which are pure and well-pleasing to Him. God, however, accepteth sac-

rifices from men only through His priests. God in the prophets (προλαβών) witnesseth that He is well-pleased with all men, therefore, who through the name of Jesus Christ [offer] the sacrifices which He (Christ) enjoined, that is, in the thanksgiving of the bread and of the cup, which sacrifices are made by the Christians in every place upon earth.

"But the sacrifices, which are made by you [Jews] and by those priests of yours, God rejects, saying" (Mal. i. 10), "'And your sacrifices I will not receive at your hands, because,' as He says, 'from the rising of the sun to his setting, My name hath been glorified among the Gentiles, but ye profane it.' And ye [Jews], in your love of contention, still persist in saying that it was the sacrifices of those then living in Jerusalem under the name of Israelites which God rejected; but that the prayers of the men of that race, who were then in a state of dispersion, God expressly received and called their prayers sacrifices.

"Now, in your assertion that the prayers and thanksgivings [Eucharists], made by worthy men, are the only sacrifices which are perfect and well-pleasing unto God, I entirely agree with you, for these things only have Christians also received for to do even for a remembrance;[1] and in connection with their food, alike solid and liquid, there is a remembrance of God and of the suffering which God suffered through Him" (that is, probably, through, or in the person of, Christ).

(*b.*) *From the Apology.*

This is an important and interesting quotation from Justin Martyr; but, before commenting on it, let us pro-

[1] The Greek here is very obscure and the text apparently corrupt. We give the best rendering we can of the words και επ' αναμνησει δε της τροφης αυτων ξηρας τε και ὑγρᾶς ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πέπονθε δι αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται.

duce another passage from the same writer's Apology, that so this entire representation of the Lord's Supper, in the middle of the second century, may lie before the reader at one glance.

In the course of admitting a new member into the Christian assembly, writes Justin (Apol. Prim. ch. xcvii.) :—

"Then, after thus washing[1] the believer, who has taken his place among us, we conduct him to the brethren, as they are called, in the place where they are assembled for the earnest offering of common prayers as well for themselves, as for him who has been enlightened, and for all in every place, that we may be thought worthy, after having learned the things which are true, to be also found good citizens in our works and keepers of the commandments, so that we may be saved with the eternal salvation.

"At the end of our prayers we salute one another with a kiss. Then there is brought to him who presides over the brethren[2] bread and a cup of water and mixture; and the president, upon receiving this, gives praise and glory to the Father of all things through the name of His Son and of the Holy Spirit; and he makes a great thanksgiving for being thought worthy of these things by God. When he has completed his prayers and his thanksgiving, all the people who are present assent to his good words, saying Amen. Now the 'Amen' is a Hebrew word signifying, So be it.

"After this thanksgiving of the president and this assent of all the people, those who are called deacons amongst us give to each of those who are present a portion of the bread and wine and water over which the thanksgiv-

[1] μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι. [2] τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

ing has been pronounced, and to those who are not present they carry portions away. And this food is called amongst us Eucharist [that is, thanksgiving], and of it only he is allowed to partake who believes the things taught by us to be true, who has washed in the washing for remission of sins and for regeneration, and who so lives as Christ enjoined.

"For we regard not these things as common bread or a common beverage; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the word of God and bore flesh and blood for our salvation, so have we been taught that the food over which prayer and giving of thanks have been said according to His command—(and by this food in its assimilation [its change][1] the blood and the flesh of each and all of us are nourished)—that this food is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who Himself was made flesh. For the apostles, in the memoirs, called Gospels, which were composed by them, have thus narrated that a command was laid on them when Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said, This do for the remembrance of Me; this is My body: and when, having taken the cup likewise and given thanks, He said, This is My blood; and that He gave portions to them only.

"And this, we are told by those who are initiated in the mysteries of Mithras, is done [among them], the imitation having been introduced by the wicked demons. For that bread and a cup of water, with certain added words, have their place among the rites of him that is initiated, is a matter which ye either know or can ascertain. But we [Christians] after these things, for the future, continually remind one another of these things; and those among us who have possessions give aid to all

[1] κατὰ μεταβολήν.

who are in want; and there is a continual association amongst us. And for all our food[1] we bless the Maker of all things through His Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Spirit.

"And on the day called Sunday we have an assembly alike of those who dwell in town or country; and we read as much of the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets as time permits.

"Then, upon the reader's ceasing, the president admonishes and exhorts us to imitate their good examples.

"After that we all stand up together and pray, and, prayer ended, there is brought bread and wine and water; and the president lifts up his voice in prayer and thanksgiving to the best of his power, and the people assent to his good words with their Amen.

"Then there is made the distribution to each individual, and the participation by each of the things over which thanks have been given; and to those who are not present with us portions are sent by the deacons.

"Those who are well off and inclined to do so, give each as he likes and determines; and that which is collected is deposited with the president, and he assists those who are desolate and in distress."

(c.) *Comments on these Passages.*

Thus have we set out before the reader Justin's full account of the Lord's Supper as it was administered in his day, some hundred and twenty years after its first institution by the Saviour—some fifty or sixty years after the death of the latest survivors among the apostles. Though we have only given two extracts from Justin, one from the Dialogue and one from the Apology, yet it will

[1] ἐπὶ πᾶσι τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα.

be observed that these two passages contain three distinct and more or less complete references to the "breaking of bread." One occurs in the Dialogue with Trypho; the second describes the communion of a newly-baptized Christian; and then, immediately upon that, follows, in the Apology, a description of the Lord's Supper as it was celebrated on each Sunday by the Christian congregation.

In later times much reserve was practiced by believers with reference to this sacred rite. They were unwilling to speak of it in detail or to write about it, except for those who were already baptized communicants, or were in the way of speedily becoming so. Of any such reticence, however, no sign is indicated by Justin. As St. Paul wrote openly on the subject to the Corinthian Church; as the apostle wished the uninitiated and unbelievers to be instructed, and impressed, and won by looking on at the Christian Eucharist; just so Justin, too, makes no difficulty about treating of the holy Supper with the most entire frankness. Whether he addresses the unbelieving Jew, Trypho, or whether his defence is made before one or other of Rome's heathen emperors, Justin lays bare the Christian practice of the sacrament without any trace of a wish to throw a veil over the whole of the rite, or over any part of it.

If this primitive candor and simplicity had been maintained by later Christians, how much less danger must they have incurred of their doings being misunderstood and misrepresented! If the Christian assemblies had continued open to the inspection of any visitor, there would have been less opportunity for the enemies of the Gospel to disseminate horrible scandals concerning the alleged Thyestean feasts and other abominations which they charged against the Church. As opposed to any attempt

or wish to conceal the acts and significance of the Lord's Supper, we should notice Justin's readiness to reiterate his explanation of the eucharistic customs in his day.

The first matter of detail which presents itself to our notice in Justin's words, is his statement concerning the Christian priesthood. The true priestly race, he writes, are "*we*"—I, Justin, who am not set apart as a Christian minister, not ordained: I, a believing layman, and the rest of the believers, alike ministers and people,—"we" are God's true *priests*. We it is who, in every place among all nations, are enjoined by God to offer to Him sacrifices which shall be as well-pleasing as they are pure.

There is a sound and a spirit in these words of Justin which reminds us how St. Peter and St. John (1 Peter ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6) had taught that all believers are "an holy priesthood," "a royal priesthood," "kings and priests unto God." Justin makes it plain that, even at the Table of the Lord, however much there may be deacons and presbyters or overseers (bishops), there are no officials of the Church who, any more than the simplest members of that Church, can be called sacrificing priests. On the contrary, Christ being, literally, the one and only Sacrificing Priest or High-Priest, all believers, alike lay and clerical, are, in Justin's estimation, even as in the judgment of the apostles, all of them, metaphorically, priests unto God.

Justin's next important point is that all Christians, as priests, must offer sacrifices unto God; and the nature of those sacrifices he proceeds to make clear. They are, he says, none other than "only prayers and thanksgivings made by worthy men"; and among these is included "the thanksgiving [or Eucharist] of the bread and wine."

Justin here calls the thanksgiving over the bread and

wine a sacrifice which all Christians everywhere offer to God through the name of Jesus Christ. Observe, it is the thanksgiving through Christ that Justin in this passage calls a sacrifice; and, exactly in the same manner, the apostles taught that we should all offer to God the spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving and prayer. It is true Scripture never designates the bread and wine of the Supper as "sacrifices." Scripture never brings the bread and wine into such close verbal association with the "sacrifice" of thanksgiving as Justin here does. We should notice this deviation from Scripture usage. New customs of language make room for new ideas; and we shall presently find that, even in the writings of Justin himself, there is a further departure from Scripture precedent to be noticed ere long. Still, in this passage now under review, where the Eucharist of bread and wine is called a sacrifice *only* as being a kind of thanksgiving, it is hard to say that we find anything in plain and direct contravention of the spirit of the New Testament in describing thanksgiving as a proper spiritual sacrifice, whether it be felt and spoken at the Table of the Lord, over bread and wine, or in any other place and under any other circumstances.

It is to be regretted that Justin did not always confine himself to this strictly defined use of the word sacrifice. Elsewhere, he calls the eucharistic elements a sacrifice without limiting his meaning to a spiritual offering of thanksgiving. No doubt he meant that the presentation of bread and wine was an acted thanksgiving, and so was a spiritual sacrifice. This would be a permissible and hardly an unscriptural use of words; but the unguarded and undefined employment of the term "sacrifice" readily lends itself to the upholding of the unscriptural idea

that there are other sacrifices for sin besides that once offered by Christ upon the cross.

In the obscure and hardly grammatical words with which this first quotation from Justin closes, the one thing which impresses itself on the reader is that the Eucharist was regarded, in the middle of the second century, as pre-eminently a *memorial* rite. In connection with their "food, alike solid and liquid," there is a marked emphasis placed on the duty of associating all nutriment of the body with a remembrance of Christ's sufferings for us. If the thanksgiving over the bread and wine was a spiritual sacrifice to be offered by all believers, lay and clerical, in their common capacity of priests unto God, all Christians were bound, each time they partook of bread and wine, to commemorate in their minds the one perfect sacrifice of Christ's sufferings. Thus, on Justin's showing, the sacramental bread and wine, in the public congregations, were far from being the only reminder of Christ's death. Such a recollection was to be called up in the believer's mind by every participation of food, "either liquid or solid."

And now we come to our second quotation from Justin, the passage in which he explains to the Roman emperor two parts of Christian life:—

1. The participation of the Eucharist among the brethren by a newly baptized believer.
2. The administration of the Eucharist in the assembly of believers on the Sunday.

In the preface to the earlier of these two descriptions of the Eucharist it is very interesting to observe the sympathy of the brethren for their newly-admitted member. Not only should we notice their prayers for him, but for themselves also, and for the universal Church. Nor is it

only the catholicity of these supplications which is instructive. but their burthen also while they ask that, as God has deigned to teach us the truth, so we may by our works evince ourselves to be good citizens, good members together of the Christian commonwealth, and faithful observers of its laws and commandments. So, by knowledge of the truth, by good works as fellow-citizens, and by compliance with Christ's laws, shall we be saved with the eternal salvation.

Next follows a reference to the kiss of peace with which the newly baptized was welcomed among his fellow-citizens. And then we come to the eucharistic rite itself. Justin represents some one of the brethren as being their president and leading their devotions throughout the Supper. This president is not designated or characterized in any way as an ordained person. He is not represented as a bishop or a presbyter or a deacon. He is simply, for the occasion, the president of the brethren. Obviously, he might be a Church-officer; and, if a Church-officer was present, he would most naturally preside over the brethren: but Justin tells the emperor nothing about this. Rather, his representation of the "president of the brethren" tallies with what we have seen in some earlier pages of this essay. As the head of each Jewish family or party presided at the Passover supper; as our Saviour in this capacity presided at the Last Supper; as heads of families were sure to preside in "the breaking of bread at home" mentioned in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles: so here, in Justin's Apology, the picture presented to us is not of a presbyter becoming, as distinguished from the congregation, a sacrificing priest, but of one, among a body of brethren who were all equally priests by reason of their citizenship in Christ,

selected as their president for the occasion or for a longer period.

B. *Principles laid down by Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Augustin—the last as quoted by Gratian.*

This point which is thus brought out by Justin's use of the word "president" is insisted upon by several later Fathers. Thus, Tertullian (De Exhortatione Castitatis, c. vii. p. 522) teaches, "Are not even we laymen priests?" Accordingly, where no ordained ministers are present, he continues, "Thou offerest [up the thanksgiving over the bread and wine] and thou baptizest, and thou art a priest, alone, for thyself." Similarly, Chrysostom (2 Homil. 2 Tim. vol. xi. p. 671, edit. Benedict.) taught, "I am about to say what may appear strange, but be not astonished or startled at it. The offering [of the sacramental thanksgiving] is the same whether a common man[1] or Paul or Peter offer it." To the same effect Jerome (Adv. Lucif. vol. ii. p. 141, edit. Basil. ap. Frohn.) alleges the validity of a sacrament administered by a layman on the principle that "as any one receives, so also can he give." Thus, the baptized can give the baptism he has received; the partaker of the Lord's Supper can administer the Lord's Supper. And so, once more, unless Gratian (Corp. Juris. Canon. Pars iii. de Consecr. Distinctio 4, c. 21), entirely against his own convictions and predilections, misquotes a letter from Augustin to Fortunatus, that great writer represents this opinion as prevalent in his time when he says, "We are accustomed to hear that even laymen are wont to administer a sacrament which they have received."

This absence of any absolutely distinctive priesthood from men in holy orders; this common character of

[1] κἂν ὁ τυχὼν προσενέγκῃ.

priesthood in all believers, lay and clerical; this qualification of the Christian layman to administer the Eucharist in the capacity of a president among his fellow-believers, who are all, likewise, priests as much as himself;—this is a line of instruction that is enforced by no lesser men than Justin, Tertullian, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustin: and, what is far more important, it is in keeping with the example and teaching of our Saviour and His apostles. Assuredly, it is a line of instruction not without its usefulness and its aptitude, alike for celebrants and communicants, in this later portion of the nineteenth century.

C. *Further Comments on Justin.*

Justin tells us that the elements employed in the sacrament were bread and a mixture of wine and water. This using water mixed with the wine is so harmless a custom, and was so likely to have been the course adopted by our Saviour himself, that we should hardly be surprised if an attempt were made to procure the removal of those legal barriers that now forbid its adoption in the English Church: and yet it is a small matter, a point of all but absolute indifference either way; and, in such cases, because of their bearing upon more important matters, it is generally the wisest course to imitate, as nearly as possible, the precise example set before us in the Scripture record, rather than to adopt an ideal course of our own. On this principle, as our Lord made no mention of wine and water, but only of wine, in His institution of the Eucharist, it may be wise to "let well alone" in the regulations regarding the cup that now prevail in the Church of England.

Justin goes on to tell us that the president, on receiv-

ing the bread and wine, gives praise and glory to God, the Father of all things (thus imitating the custom of the Paschal supper among the Jews), with the characteristic Christian recognition of the Son and the Holy Spirit through whom the Father bestows His blessings. Upon this follows a full and particular thanksgiving to God for deigning to make the congregation partakers of all His gifts and of the sacramental bread and wine.

It is important to notice that, upon the conclusion of his prayers and thanksgivings by the president, great stress is laid by Justin upon *all* the people, who are present, associating themselves in the offering of those spiritual sacrifices by their conjoint[1] and crowning assent in the utterance of the word "Amen," whose significance is "So let it be." True, for the sake of order and comeliness, the president has, so far, been their mouthpiece and spokesman; but it must not be supposed that they have been indifferent spectators; it must not be thought the president has been thinking and feeling and making vows instead of them, without their taking an active and intelligent part in all that he has done. So far from this, the time has now come for them, with the grand effect of voice coming from a multitude, to pronounce their hearty assent in the loud Amen, So may it be; So would we have it. It is too common a fault among us, in modern times, to neglect this our conjoint action with the president, this our active part in the priestly and other functions he is discharging as our representative. Such negligence finds no excuse in Justin's picture of the early Christians, or in St. Paul's representation of the apostolic Church.

After repeating his statement that the president pro-

[1] πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων Ἀμήν.

nounced the thanksgiving, and the whole people gave their glad acclaim of assent to it, Justin tells the emperor it was the duty of those who were styled "deacons" among the Christians to give to each member of the congregation a piece of the bread and a portion of the wine and water, and even to any absent members of the Christian body the deacons carried similar portions. There is no failure on Justin's part to inform his readers that the wine of the Eucharist was partaken of by each member of the Church just as all partook of the bread.

As we found a verb akin to "Eucharist" employed for the giving of thanks, in the Supper, by St. Paul and by the Lord Himself, so, in this passage, Justin tells us that the noun "Eucharist" was the name among Christians for "this food," as he calls the bread and wine.

Justin's next point is, that no one was permitted to take part in the Eucharist unless he was prepared for such participation by three qualifications:—He must believe in the truth of the things taught by Christians; he must have submitted himself to the washing for putting away of sin and for regeneration; and he must be living in compliance with the injunctions of Christ. Mark, there is no requirement of auricular or any other confession to a Church-officer; there is no preparatory penance to be undergone; neither is there any semblance of sacerdotal absolution. Mark again, that attached to the Hebraism for baptism[1] are the spiritual characteristics of putting away sin and being born again into sonship to God; and, besides such baptism, that which is required of communicants in the Supper is belief of the Christian truth and carrying out of the Christian life.

And now we come to a deeply interesting part of this

[1] λουσαμένῳ τὸ λουτρόν, having washed the washing.

quotation from Justin. However obscure and involved may have been the Greek which Justin here wrote; however corrupt the text of the passage may have become; as matters stand, several points appear to be intended and established by the writer with unquestionable distinctness.

First of all, the Christians of Justin's time did not regard the eucharistic elements as "common bread or common beverage." This special estimation of the eucharistic elements may mean very little or it may mean a great deal. How much it meant must depend on the words which follow. Obviously a building, which is hallowed by certain associations that cling to one's mind, is no longer a common building in the thoughts of him who is possessed by those associations. It was the jail in which Bunyan wrote; or it was the house in which Shakespeare courted Ann Hathaway; or it was the birthplace, or the familiar haunt, or the grave of one or other of the men who bear more than kingly sway over our minds. These, and a thousand other hallowing associations, make the cell of a jail, the kitchen of a cottage, or the lowliest spot on earth to be no longer common and like other places for us. So too, a book or any object, which has been much used and loved by a friend who was very dear to us, is no longer a common book like any other copy of the same work. And, in the same manner, with however infinitely higher associations, bread and wine, which have been hallowed as special tokens and reminders of the death of our Redeemer, can no longer be common and ordinary objects in our estimation.

Such a general sentiment, which lies at the bottom of what Justin is now saying to us, is a feeling in which well-nigh every man must sympathize. Justin, however,

proceeds to something more definite than this. He institutes a comparison between the incarnation of our Saviour through the word of God, and the food (whereby our flesh and blood are nourished), but which, through the word of prayer and thanksgiving enjoined by Christ, is,[1] as Christians were then taught, the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus.

(*a.*) *Justin's Adoption of "This is My body," and "This is My blood."*

Before commenting on these words let us see, as Justin continues his line of thought, what is the ground and reason which he assigns for this statement. It is none other than that, in the original institution by our Lord Himself, the words used over the bread were, This is my body; and those used over the cup were, This is my blood.

Obviously, in certain conditions of Justin's memory, if not in his general and pervading apprehension of Christ's teaching, all trace of the fuller statement, This is My blood of the covenant, has been lost. Still less does he bear in mind that, as we have seen, it is a moral certainty that Jesus did not say, This is My blood of the covenant, but did say, This is the new covenant in My blood; and, similarly, did not say, This is My body, but did say, This is the new covenant in My body.

Here we have the point of bifurcation for Christian thought. Henceforward, if not even from an earlier date than that of Justin, there will be two distinct streams of Christian principle recognizable in well-nigh every thinker and every writer of any eminence. At one time the imperfect and abridged, and paraphrastic version of the Saviour's words, This is My body, This is My blood, will

[1] εἶναι.

cling to each mind and impress it. At another time the same Christian mind will be under other, and truer, and more spiritual influence; and there will be a powerful reaction against the materializing of spiritual things which is sure to arise out of this curtailed and misleading statement of our Lord's real words as He employed them at the institution of the Eucharist, and as they stand recorded by St. Luke and St. Paul.

Not until a later point in this our essay will it be appropriate to show, in the words of the Fathers themselves, the form and direction taken by this pious and reasonable reaction. Here, and at present, we go not beyond the record of Justin's Apology. He and his contemporaries believed that, as Jesus was made flesh and bore (or took[1]) flesh and blood for our salvation, similarly eucharistic bread and wine "are" the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus.

This was their opinion; and, if we can rely on the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistle to the people of Smyrna, it was some half a century older than even Justin's writing, for Ignatius there blames certain heretics in these words, "They [the Docetæ] abstain from the Eucharist and from public prayer because they do not acknowledge that the Eucharist is[2] the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which[3] suffered for our sins and which the Father in His kindness raised." Whether these words were written by Ignatius or not, we have the distinct and definite belief of Justin and his contemporaries—that eucharistic bread and wine were not common nutriment, were not like other ordinary food, because they were in some sense the flesh and blood of Christ.

This important opinion of Justin should by no means

[1] ἔσχεν. [2] εἶναι. [3] τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίων ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν.

be ignored; but neither should we forget that the greatest of the so-called Fathers of the Church explain that when they designate the sign, bread or wine, by the name of the thing signified, body or blood, they do so with no notion of a change of substance, but only to lift men's minds from the low level of the material signs to the high contemplation of the heavenly sacrifice. This we should remember; and, moreover, we should not forget that Justin's opinion, quoted above, was avowedly based altogether on the conception that Jesus said, This is My body, This is My blood; so that, inasmuch as Jesus said something else, according to Luke and Paul, instead of those words, the opinion must vary, or must vanish, together with the varying signification or the entire vanishing of the above reason upon which Justin tells us that it rested.

If Jesus meant in the institution, This cup is the new covenant ratified by My blood which is shed for you and for many, for the putting away of sin, then this would be the true interpretation of Justin's dangerous abbreviation, This is My blood. If Jesus meant and said (as St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 25, represents him to have said and meant), This cup is a participation[1] of the new covenant in My blood, then this is very different from the signification likely to be put on its abridged form, This is My blood; and to the extent of this, the real utterance and meaning of our Saviour, would Justin's own reason for the belief that was in him compel us to modify the bald and literal interpretation of Justin's opinion that the eucharistic bread and wine are the flesh and blood of Jesus.

Because the Lord said, This cup is a means of partici-

[1] κοινωνία, a communion, a fellowship, a participation, a means of entering into.

pation in the new covenant ratified by the shedding of My blood; therefore, on his own showing, Justin, if he had borne those words of the Saviour in mind when he was writing the words of our quotation, would have expressed himself thus: The eucharistic bread and wine is no longer common and ordinary nutriment, because it is hallowed in our memory by association with the death of Christ, because it is a reminder of Christ's giving His body and His blood for our salvation—because, as Jesus taught, it is a perpetually blessed means of entering into and sustaining the fellowship of us all in the new covenant ratified by the shedding of Christ's blood.

If Justin (and perhaps Ignatius before him) and many another writer in the centuries that were to follow, had borne in mind the real words of Jesus and had abstained from unduly curtailing those words, the painful inconsistencies of patristic opinion on this subject would have been avoided; on this point, at all events, there would have been no injurious division in the mind of the Church: on this important topic we should all have been at one among ourselves and with the Saviour.

(*b.*) *Justin's Reference to the "Mysteries" of the God Mithras.*

Having thus noticed this belief and the ground on which it rests, we pass on to the next point in our quotation; and in this Justin gives us the strange piece of information that, in the mysteries of the Persian god Mithras, the worshippers partook of bread and a cup of water over which certain formularies were spoken. And this imitation of the Christian sacrament has, in Justin's opinion, been brought about by the suggestion of the evil demons. This ancient idea, of wicked spirits causing

spurious imitations of parts of the Christian ritual, puts one in mind of the thoughts which are said to have occurred to the Jesuit missionaries as they discovered, in the religion of Buddha, very close resemblances to the Madonna and Child, the priesthood, the monastic orders, and numerous other portions of their own system.

Possibly, to the intelligent modern reader, far simpler and yet deeper and more instructive explanations of such phenomena will present themselves. We must not, however, dwell upon this subject here. Neither is this the place for a disquisition concerning the extent to which Rome and her empire and her wars made nations acquainted with one another, and brought together, in the capital, specimens of the diverse modes of worship that were in use among the Egyptians, the Jews, the Persians, and countless other tribes. How Justin, in some visit to Rome, may have ascertained the particulars he here mentions, can only be matter of surmise.

Arising out of this reference to the worship of Mithras there is, however, one point quite worthy of notice. We refer to Justin's bringing the "mysteries" of heathen religion into comparison—as it were, into contact—with Christianity, and especially with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The participation of bread and wine in the Christian Eucharist has, according to Justin, its counterpart or its imitation in the participation of bread and water by the initiated in the mysteries of Mithras. The one rite is so far like the other, in words of thanksgiving or of administration, as well as in elements to be partaken of, that, however little the resemblance may have been suggested by evil spirits, yet the parallelism is undeniable, and the mysteries of Mithras are clearly and unquestionably, teaches Justin, an imitation of the Christian Eucharist.

We are far from risking the affirmation that never, at any earlier date, had points of analogy been observed between the Lord's Supper and the "mysteries" of heathen religions. We neither say nor think that in every point of comparison there was agreement. Obviously, Justin made no secret of the nature and meaning and mode of celebration attaching to the Eucharist; whereas no worshipper at Eleusis, or at any of the heathen mysteries, would have been willing, or would have dared, to divulge to the Jew Trypho, or to the Roman emperor, the nature and signification and mode of initiation connected with any mystery of a prevailing heathen religion.

In this point of secrecy in the heathen mysteries and of entire frankness in the earliest portraiture of the Lord's Supper, alike by the Samaritan layman Justin and by the great apostle St. Paul, there is an unlikeness between the real Christ and Mithras, between the openly instructing communion of the Lord's Table and the jealously guarded initiation in some obscure shrine of heathendom.

Even of those mysteries of Mithras how little does Justin say! "Bread and water" are employed, "with certain added formularies which ye either know or may learn!" Mithras had his secret only to be told to the initiated; and, however unimportant or however momentous might be the burthen of that secret, it was not to be mentioned to the profane.

As Christianity, in the succeeding centuries, adopted this Greek name,[1] "mystery," as another designation for the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist lost the transparent candor and openness of its early days; and it, too, came to be regarded as a secret rite whose meaning and celebra-

[1] μυστήριον, a secret revealed.

tion must be kept hidden from all except those who, as catechumens and as recipients of baptism, had been duly initiated.

Observe, however, that in heathendom, and in the Christianity of the earliest days, men never dreamt that the "mysteries" were an unintelligible secret for the initiated. Contrariwise, those who were not worshippers of Mithras knew and understood little or nothing of the bread and water and the form of words connected with them; but any man who chose to be admitted to the worship of that Persian deity was, in the act of admission and initiation, instructed as to the nature of the outward and visible signs or symbols and as to the meaning, or purport, or intention which was signified by them. Thus, "mysteries," the most solemn and sacred among the heathens—those mysteries whose divulging was profanity, to be visited by the most terrible penalties—were secrets only to the uninitiated. To those who took part in any "mysteries" all was explained. This explanation was "initiation." He who knew not the symbols, bread and water, or whatever in each case they might be, or he who knew not the religious significance of those symbols, was not initiated. To strangers and outsiders the "mysteries" were a secret still hidden: but to those who frequented the shrine and gained admission to its *arcana*, the "mysteries" became a secret revealed.

So had the New Testament writers employed the term "mystery." They never, indeed, designated the Lord's Supper as a mystery; but whatever they did call by that name was a secret no longer hidden, but clearly revealed. In later ages the opinion grew up that the Christian Eucharist was a terrific subject of obscurity—something to be jealously kept secret from the unbaptized; and in this

misconception it is only too easy to perceive a fruitful source of the charges brought against the Church, that her secret observances were abominable, that her kiss of charity was impure, that her Supper of the Lord was preceded by the murder of an innocent, and consisted in the eating of its flesh. How near the truth were these false charges! How they would be fostered, and were fostered, by secrecy! How a ray of apostolic light and publicity would have prevented much of the persecutor's cruelty, much of the martyr's suffering.

If in any age, primitive or modern, the Christian sacraments are called "mysteries," it is most desirable that the term should be used correctly, as signifying symbols, like the bread and wine, with a definite and intelligible meaning, according to which they remind us of the redeeming death of Christ till His coming again, and they thus bind and incorporate us into fellowship with His body once given for us, and they also unite and associate us all into membership in His body the Church, into corporate union one with another, each with all.

Let the outward sign and the inward signification be thus apprehended as they were by the Saviour and by His apostles and disciples; and then "mystery," a secret not known to unbelievers, a blessed revelation to all who come to Christ, will be a most appropriate and felicitous title for the Lord's Supper, to be added to those which Scripture and the history of the earliest Christians have already brought under our notice.

So important is Justin's comparison between the Eucharist and the mysteries of Mithras. So is that comparison an illustration, or, possibly, the origin of the application of the name "mystery" to the Christian breaking of bread.

At a later point in our inquiry it will be necessary to revert to this subject. For the present these remarks may suffice to guard us against any misapprehension to the effect that the Lord's Supper, because it is rightly called a mystery, is therefore in part or wholly unintelligible even to the most devout of worshippers.

After this allusion to the mysteries of Mithras, Justin points out how completely and persistently the Lord's Supper is an act of communion and fellowship of Christian men, one with another. The sacrament completed, there is not an end of our communion; but we thenceforward continually remind one another of what was done, and what was promised, and what was meant in the Eucharist: there is a continual interchange of partnership and help between the more wealthy and the more necessitous among us; indeed, we never cease, in the highest and best sense, to be together.[1]

And, as if this prolongation of the Eucharist into a lifelong fellowship with men did not complete Justin's idea of the Christian communion in the Supper, he adds that never do the recipients of that sacrament partake of any nourishment for their bodies without blessing[2] the Maker of all things through His Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Spirit. So abiding, and continuous, and all-comprehensive alike of God and man, is the union and fellowship which is cemented at the believer's earliest celebration of the Eucharist, and never ceases from that day forward.

But yet, it would seem as if Justin wished to urge upon the attention of his reader, We do not leave the continuance of this union, between the Christian and his

[1] *καὶ σύνεσμεν ἀλλήλοις ἀεί.*

[2] *εὐλογοῦμεν*, the eucharistic term for blessing pronounced over the bread and wine.

fellow-men and his God, to the general and sustained recollection thus indicated to you; but there is a fixed day in each week, the day especially named after the sun (Sunday, as we moderns call it still), and on that day we hold an assembly of all believers whom we can bring together from town or country.

In this Sunday worship of Justin's contemporaries it is most interesting to notice that the characteristic features were:—

1. Reading the Gospels and the Prophets.
2. A practical discourse by the president of the assembly.
3. Common prayer by all the assembly in a standing attitude.[1]
4. The bringing in of bread and wine, over which the president prays and gives thanks; the people's assent with their "Amen"; the distribution by the deacons to all who are present and to any who may be absent.
5. An offertory in which those who are well off give according to their own wish and deliberate choice; and, the proceeds being deposited with the president, he assists the needy.

The point of resemblance, between this ancient Sunday service and Christian worship in modern times, are happily numerous and conspicuous. It is not necessary to dwell on them at any length.

The "sermon" is represented as highly practical, consisting of exhortations to the imitation of whatever good examples had been set before the congregation in the "Lessons," as we call them, of the prophets and apostles.

In the Common Prayer not only is the standing atti-

[1] ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν.

tude worthy of observation by us of the English Church, to teach us sympathy in this respect with the Presbyterians, but this attitude of *standing* to pray may be instructive for any who are disposed to fall into excessive practices of prostration in their prayers, particularly in their devotions on approaching the Lord's Table. Clearly, a very different custom prevailed in the Church which was familiar to the eyes of Justin in the second century.

Very important and very full of instruction for us is the picture of every believer joining heartily in the prayer of that ancient Sunday worship. The president did not pray in their stead while they were listless, or bore the appearance of being weary; but they stood up and, whether repeating aloud some prearranged supplication, or whether silently listening to their president, or however they expressed their emotion, it was made apparent to Justin and to any observer that every member of the congregation was praying.

In all which follows, concerning the bread and wine, and the president's thanksgiving, and the people's "Amen," and the participation of the elements, and concerning the offertory and its distribution, Justin adds little, if anything, to that which he had told us in his previous description of the communion of the newly baptized. Here is nothing calling for special remark over and above what has been elicited by Justin's two earlier descriptions of the Eucharist.

We leave this full and frank portraiture of the sacrament which Justin set before the Jew Trypho and the unbelieving Roman emperor with a distinct impression that, towards the middle of the second century, all Christian lay people were recognized to be as fully and truly priests as any of the clergy. With regard to

priesthood, there was no difference between the laity and the president who ministered in the Eucharist. This marks a point of agreement between Justin and the New Testament, but it marks also a portentous difference between our author and the sacerdotalism of the Middle Ages.

Every worthy recipient of the Lord's Supper did, in Justin's estimation, offer a sacrifice to God, but that sacrifice, though it included the eucharistic elements of bread and wine, still consisted, in strictness, according to Justin's express testimony, "only" of prayers and thanksgivings, the very "spiritual" sacrifices which, in the New Testament, are enjoined upon the entire body of believers. The whole eucharistic service, as represented by Justin, was an appeal to the intelligent sympathy of the people. Unless they came "worthy" or "meet" to pray, unless they joined, each and all of them, in the prayers and thanksgiving, unless their "Amen" was a hearty and intelligent assent to the president's prayers and thanksgivings, Justin, like St. Paul, would manifestly have pronounced their coming together to be no eating the Supper of the Lord.

So far Justin represents to us, in this passage, a simple, Scriptural, and beautiful picture of primitive worship and communion.

But we have seen that this is not all. Justin added that, after prayer and thanksgiving had been said over the elements in accordance with Christ's command, those elements were no longer ordinary bread and wine. They were the flesh and blood of Christ, because the Lord had said, in appointing the Eucharist for His remembrance, This is My body, This is My blood.

To what extent Justin and the great writers of Christ-

ian antiquity understood these words literally, to what extent they limited and modified their meaning and gave them a figurative interpretation, we shall inquire in the sequel; but, except in this part of his teaching on the Lord's Supper, there is no trace of Justin's holding that Christ was objectively present in or with the bread and wine of the Eucharist.

If, instead of the abridged form, This is My blood, Justin had kept steadily before his own mind and that of his readers the fuller and more accurate record of what our Saviour said and meant, the result, logically, would have been very strongly marked. His words must then have been to this effect: The eucharistic bread and wine are the flesh and blood of Christ, because the Lord said, in instituting the sacrament, This bread and this cup are a fellowship, or means of participation, in the new covenant ratified by My body given and by My blood shed for you and for many for the putting away of sin.

To argue, from Christ saying the cup was a participation in the new covenant sealed by His blood-shedding, that that same cup was the blood of Christ, is as gross and palpable an abuse of reasoning as can well be conceived.

And, be it remembered—even if any reader still remains convinced, in spite of all that has been said in our previous pages, that the very words spoken by Christ were, This is My blood of the covenant—this, however improbable, however morally impossible we may deem such a conclusion, however it may obscure the thoughts and confuse the mind of him who entertains it,—still this version of our Saviour's words cannot alter the logical statement just set out by us, as long as the words of St. Paul and St. Luke remain as the Scriptural, and therefore the only absolutely authoritative, interpretation of what was meant by, This is My blood of the covenant.

For let us state the argument in full, on the supposition that the precise words of Jesus were, This is My blood; and the result will come out thus: This bread and this wine are the flesh and blood of Jesus, because the Lord said, at the institution, This bread and this cup are My body and blood, *meaning* (as we are taught by St. Paul and St. Luke), This bread and this cup are a participation in the new covenant sealed by the giving of My body and by the shedding of my blood for the putting away of sin.

Until any man shall be rash enough to say that St. Paul and St. Luke neither give the words of Jesus, nor express His meaning in the terms which they record as having been spoken by Him, this fatal flaw must remain in the reasoning by which Justin argues that bread and wine are flesh and blood, because Jesus said or meant that they were a participation in the new covenant ratified by His giving His body and shedding His blood.

Wherever this train of reasoning occurs, This bread is My literal and objective flesh, because it is a fellowship in the new covenant ratified by the death of My body, its obvious fallaciousness must surely be apparent, until "flesh" and "participation in a covenant ratified by the death of a body" shall be precisely equivalent and exchangeable phrases.

D. *Occasional Ambiguity the utmost charge, with reference to materializing Christ's Presence, that can be brought against Justin and the Early Christian Writers.*

Here, then, we find in Justin Martyr what some will regard as traces of two lines of thought, two forms of expression. His prevailing train of thought, his all but

universal mode of utterance, is distinctly opposed to the theories and practices of modern sacerdotalism; but, in two or three of the lines written by him which we have been examining, there is a semblance at least of Justin's having maintained one part of the materialistic theory of the sacrament—that, namely, which teaches that the eucharistic elements are the flesh and blood of Christ.

And this same peculiarity will be found to exist in very many of the "Fathers" of the Church. At one time they give the most spiritual character to the Lord's Supper and to Christ's presence at the Supper. And then, at another time, they seem inconsistent with themselves, and they give an apparent sanction to the idea that, because the abridged form of Christ's words is, This is My body. This is My blood, therefore the bread and wine are, or become, or are transformed into the flesh and blood of Jesus as if He were materially and objectively present on His Table.

To produce examples, in detail, of this twofold teaching of the ancient Christian writers, would extend the length of this essay beyond what our plan permits or requires. Suffice it to say that a string of patristic quotations, with a materialistic comment, may be found in the work of Dr. Pusey; whilst passages of an opposite character, or sometimes the same passages with an entirely different interpretation, may be seen in such books as Waterland's "Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist," Goode's "Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist," Blunt's "Early Fathers" (especially Lecture xii. of his Second Series), and also in the publications of the Rev. John Harrison, D.D., the present Vicar of Fenwick.

The remark, which applies to all teaching in favor of an objective presence of Christ in the elements, is that

which has been already urged on our reader's attention. It is, indeed, surprising to find how invariably the abridged form, This is My body, This is My blood, is made the basis of the enormous theories which spring out of a belief in Christ's objective presence in the bread and wine of the Eucharist. And yet this abridged form is not only interpreted literally, in spite of its obvious and necessarily figurative signification, but this abridged form is, moreover, dealt with, habitually and constantly, by writers who indulge in a materializing tendency, as if it was the only recorded form of what our Saviour said at the institution of the Supper—as if St. Matthew and St. Mark had not recorded that Jesus spoke of "blood of the covenant" (a clearly figurative phrase in itself, one would suppose)—as if St. Paul and St. Luke had not rendered the probably Aramaic words of the Lord by the phrase, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood."

Instead of giving to the reader a string of patristic quotations, some seeming to favor the notion of an objective presence of Christ in the elements, others seeming no less positively to controvert and disprove it, we wish to point out two or three tolerably marked epochs in the history connected with this idea.

E. *Epochs in the History of Sacramental Materialism.*

1. *Justin (and Ignatius?).*

Whereas we have seen that the New Testament knows absolutely nothing of an objective presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements: and, whereas Holy Writ represents Jesus, if He used words that could be abridged into the form, This is My blood, yet only to have used them in the sense, and with the meaning, This cup is the new covenant in My blood; Justin, on the contrary (and pos-

sibly Ignatius fifty years sooner), ignore all the modifying addition which Scripture appends to the form, This is My blood—and, still further, they ignore the Scriptural words, This cup is the new covenant in My blood. For them—assuredly for Justin, when he wrote the part of his Apology quoted above—there was no thought of any qualifying terms, or of any fuller explication, in a certainly figurative sense; but only there pressed on his recollection the memorable abridgment, This is My body, This is My blood; and upon this maimed and imperfect quotation of Scripture truth, Justin, like all who preceded or followed him in the idea of an objective presence of Christ in the Supper, based his notion.

Here, then, is the first marked epoch in the history of man's departure from Scriptural simplicity in the doctrine of the Eucharist.

2. *Cyprian.*

Still, in Justin's description of the Supper, the laity are as much sacrificing priests as the clergy: and the only sacrifices are prayers and thanksgivings, and (as appears in one passage[1]) the bread and wine for the Eucharist. Justin, like the New Testament writers, knows nothing of apostles or bishops or presbyters or presidents being sacerdotal, or hieratic, or priestly, in any sense apart from the whole body of believers. By the age of Cyprian, however (A. D. 250), this was changed.

Though there are not wanting passages to show that Cyprian held nothing but a figurative presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements, yet he employs language which has sufficed to give encouragement to the belief that the thank-offering of bread and wine was something

[1] Justin's words are, Προσφερομενων αὐτῷ θυσιων, τουτεστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστ ας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας. J. M. Dial, p. 260, Par. Ed.

more than a thank-offering; that it was an[1] *imitation* of the sacrifice once made by Christ upon the cross; and, accordingly, that the men, who made this imitation of the Saviour's one sacrifice, acted in Christ's stead, were His vicars, and to that extent were sacrificing priests.

Quotations, already laid before the reader, show that long after Cyprian, even in the time of Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustin, the most eminent teachers of the Church drew no very sharp and exclusive line between the clergy and the laity in respect even of administering the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Their principle was—whatever Christian rite any man, lay or cleric, has received, the same he can confer or administer. One who has been baptized can baptize: one who has been a partaker of the Lord's Supper is competent to administer that holy sacrament to others.

But still, in spite of this subsequent reaction in favor of truth, as early as the time of Cyprian we begin to find distinct marks of the belief that the thank-offering of eucharistic bread and wine was an imitation—*not a repetition, be it observed*—of Christ's one sacrifice of Himself; and that he who presided at the blessing and thanksgiving connected with that bread and wine, was acting in the place of Christ, the one and only real Priest or sacrificing Mediator.

3. *Four Unscriptural Accretions to the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.*

From the time of Cyprian onward, then, notwithstanding reactions and oppositions, we have four unscriptural

[1] "Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris, et sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem præcepit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et sic incipiat offerre quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse." Cyprian, Epist. 63.

factors intermingling themselves around the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

1. There is an ignoring of every Scriptural modification or interpretation of the words, This is My body, This is My blood.

2. There is based on these Scriptural words, used in a sense different from that of Scripture, a belief in some kind of identity between the bread and wine of the Supper and the body and blood of Christ.

3. There is an idea that the thank-offering of bread and wine is, in some degree, an imitation of the sacrifice of the death of Christ.

4. The inference is in course of being drawn that the president at the Lord's Supper, instead of being a brother among those who are all equally with himself "priests unto God" (Rev. i. 6), is discharging functions analogous to those of the great High Priest who offered Himself on the cross once for all.

4. *Working of these Accretions.*

Henceforth these four unscriptural elements of thought will be in the Christian Church. Let them be softened and toned down as much as any student may think that Cyprian and others intended they should be; let them be counteracted, as may be, by the occasional utterance of a Jerome, or a Chrysostom, or an Augustin; still they must be reckoned with, in future, as important influences in leavening the mass of Christian thought.

They will ere long become entangled with the natural custom of the bishops and presbyters being the "presidents"—to use the phrase of Justin and of Tertullian—whenever they chanced to be present at a celebration of the Lord's Supper; and so the idea will grow up, that

only bishops or presbyters can properly discharge the sacerdotal function in imitation of the Lord. Thus bishops and presbyters will come to be esteemed as priests—sacrificing priests—not in common with all believers, but in contradistinction from the rest of the people. In this manner, instead of all Christians being a royal priesthood according to Scripture, a priestly race according to Justin, there will arise a professional priesthood within the catholic priesthood of the entire Church.

5. *Circumstances particularly favorable to these Accretions.*

These five unscriptural elements of thought must, when once set working in the minds of men, have produced vast results in striking contrast with all that we have seen to characterize the teaching of the apostles on points connected with this entire subject. But when one regards these five elements for producing a revolution in any men's minds, as fostered by all the circumstances that marked the coming centuries of the Church's history, it is no marvel that they turned the world upside down.

Consider how this doctrine, of priests who could alone bless bread and wine so that it should be (in some sense) the body and blood of Christ, must have affected superstitious emperors who, like Constantine, would postpone baptism till the hour of death, that its waters might then effectually and finally wash away all sin. What would such emperors, and their more ignorant and, if possible, more superstitious subjects, be ready and anxious to make of an order of men who could, in any sense, give—or, at their pleasure, withhold—the flesh and blood of the Saviour to be taken into the mouth with the assurance that

remission of sins in this life was thus secured, and, in the life to come, endless felicity?

The claiming such power, and the belief in it, must have produced wonderful results among men of any age and country; but the actual circumstances of the Roman empire became more and more favorable to the upholding and propagating of such a system. To those who believed in this system and worked it, there came courage, consolation, and grandest hope of more than mundane victory. To those who were subjected to this system, it brought, if not comfort and hope, at all events an almost stupefying sense of terror, a narcotic influence of rest in obedience to priestly superiors and masters.

Amidst the effeminacy and alarm of Rome's children, as national dissolution came upon the Empire of the West, how must the strength of the Christian priesthood with (in some sense) the body and blood of the incarnate Son of God in their hands, under their control, have been a giant force amidst the weakened pigmies of the human race! How little could these degenerate men retain or recover the glorious liberty which Paul delighted to portray, and which Jesus gave! Here was, indeed, a soil in which the seeds contained in those five unscriptural principles must germinate and flourish.

But this was only the beginning of the circumstances and events that favored the reception and spread of these same principles of a religion most unlike to that of the New Testament. From every side there came upon the empire invasions of half-savage strangers, under the names of Lombards, or Goths, or Vandals, or Huns. Whether they came direct into Italy, or whether they occupied Gaul, or penetrated into Spain, or made their way along the northern coast of Africa, or from those shores

crossed the sea and approached the very citadel of Rome herself, in every direction these savage swarms came crushing in upon Rome and carrying victory with them in every land, in almost every fight.

Well-nigh the only resistance that opposed them bravely is typified and represented in the story of the aged bishop sallying forth from the gates of Rome, with his priests and with his sacred things, to arrest the progress of their conquest and their devastation. And this courage produced its effect, impressed the ferocious hearts of the conquerors. So it came to pass that the victorious hordes were subjugated, in their rude minds, by the religion of those whom they conquered. If, frequently, they fell under the influence of Arians on the one side, as frequently, at least, they came under the sway of Rome and her bishops. Ultimately, indeed, the entire movement was in this latter direction; and so the whole Church, or almost the whole, was a mass of effeminate citizens or rude and strong barbarians, leavened most imperfectly by any learning or refinement on the part even of the clergy.

In such a mass of uncultured men nothing could be more certain than that the very religion of Christ itself would be accepted and developed in its least spiritual aspects, in its most sensuous, material, and objective forms.

Of the two texts, "This is My blood," "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," there could be little doubt which would be most acceptable to the unlettered savages and to the ministers who now, as sacrificing priests, wielded a dark and potent spell over the laity. Such a people and such a priesthood would trouble themselves little about the problem of the elements retaining the semblance and the taste of bread and wine. Whatever of the terrible was associated with objectively and

materially eating the flesh of the God-man, and drinking His blood, would be in accordance with their predilections. The stranger the phenomenon, the greater the miracle. The less intelligible the process, the more stupendous the power of the priests who wrought out the declared results.

6. *Prevailing Opinion of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries.*

Before the incursion of the northern hordes, men's minds had swayed between the spiritual and figurative eating Christ's flesh by coming to Him, especially in the sacrament, and the grosser idea of eating Christ's flesh by the mere outward act of partaking of the eucharistic elements. The four or five hundred years that followed the downfall of Rome's empire in the West produced a mighty change in this as in so many other respects. By the ninth or tenth century it was most rare to meet with any one, lay or cleric, who doubted the miracle, of daily recurrence, by which bread and wine, in the priest's hands, under the priest's blessing, became the very flesh and blood of Jesus—yea, the flesh and blood, they said, which was born of Mary and which was crucified.

Any figurative interpretation was beyond their power of imagining. For truths and aspirations of a spiritual sort they lacked the needful habit of spiritual discernment.

From all those centuries one can produce no narrative like that of Justin Martyr. When, in the sequel, we come to examine any of the Mass-books that were growing and taking definite form through those centuries, we shall find them to contain more of contrast than of resemblance to the picture of the Lord's Supper in Justin's time—still more of contrast and opposition to all which was practised by the apostles.

Even when the light of intelligence began to be rekindled in Europe once again, doubt and inquiry concerning the miracle of transubstantiation were regarded as inimical to truth, hostile to the powerful array of the priests, offensive in the sight of God. Subtle disputations among the Schoolmen touched the mode and conditions and consequences of the transformation rather than its reality. The inquiry was not, Is the bread changed into flesh, or the wine into blood? And upon what evidence does this allegation rest? The scholastic query was not, Is the change of bread into flesh real and true? but, Assuming its truth, how is the change wrought? The "accidents" and phenomena of bread remain and we see them; but the "substance," that on which the "accidents" of color, form, and taste are superimposed —that "idea" which, being invisible, underlies all the phenomena—this we see not. This "substance," this underlying idea, may be changed and yet we see it not. Thus, the substance of bread and wine, in the Eucharist, may be changed, by the priest's words, into the *substance* of Christ's flesh and blood, and yet, the *accidents* of form and color and taste and solidity remaining unchanged, we cannot see the transubstantiation. We only believe it; and the greater the credulity—they called it faith—the more the merit.

7. *The Neglected Question, Is Credulity a Sign of Reverence?*

Those metaphysicians paused but little to reflect that the credulity, which believes without evidence or reason, is at least as presumptuous and as self-conceited as the incredulity which persists in disbelief in spite of ample evidence and sufficient reason. Credulity, in their judgment, was a virtue, the more holy the grosser it was.

If, in the middle of the third century, we found, in Cyprian's time, traces of the five elements that go to materialize the Eucharist and set up a privileged priesthood for its administration, it is not surprising that, in seven or eight succeeding centuries, the effeminacy of Rome's sons, the coarse sensuousness, not to say sensuality, of Gothic barbarians, and the disputatious metaphysics of men like Paschasius Radbertus, or Lanfranc, or Anselm, had completely developed and established a system in which bread and wine were miraculously transubstantiated into flesh and blood. The intervention of a special order of men called priests was necessary for the effecting of this miracle; without a share, vicariously or directly, in this continually repeated sacrifice, there was no safety for any man either in this world or the next; but, with such a participation, vicarious or otherwise, the soul of man was in the stronghold of safety in this life and in the safest way for the life to come.

Paschasius Radbertus and his fellow-workers inherited the accumulated errors of four or five centuries when they brought their logical astuteness to bear upon these topics and, as a consequence, elaborated their doctrine of transubstantiation.

8. *Councils (Fourth Lateran and Tridentine).*

From them it was an easy step for the Fourth Lateran Council to take the subject up and give the stamp of Rome's approval and authority, where the subtle word-fencing of these and other metaphysicians had already given definition. And thus, except for what anathemas the Council of Trent might add, three centuries later, the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation was elaborated and completed.

Instead of This cup is the new covenant in My blood—which Christ either said or meant—the only form reverenced at Rome was the abridgment, This is My body, This is my blood—which, if Christ said it, He meant necessarily in the sense of the fuller form recorded by St. Luke and St. Paul. Instead of all Christians, lay and clerical, being equally and alike priests unto God, and all qualified, on due occasion, to administer the sacrament which had been administered to them, there was a separate order of sacrificing priests railed off from the laity and endowed with a monopoly of power in the sacrifice of the Mass[1] Instead of a communion and fellowship, in both the bread and the wine, amongst all believers on the common platform of their royal priesthood in Christ, there was often a sacrifice of the Mass celebrated by a priest, who might be alone or might have one attendant with him; there was rarely a participation in the sacred feast by the laity; there was never such a participation in the cup of the Lord's Supper. Vast was the change that had come over the simple and beautiful communion of all in bread and wine as enjoined by Christ Himself and as practised by the apostles.

F. *Protests and Opposition on the part of more Spiritual Believers.*

Before we submit to the reader a translation of the later mediæval Mass-book, it is desirable to remind him that, even in the dark ages, this materializing of what we saw Christ instituted as a spiritual communion with Himself and with His whole body, the Church—this setting up of a clerical priesthood of some Christians instead of Christ's royal priesthood of all believers—had not gained

[1] "Mass," as the communion of the Lord's Supper had come to be called from the concluding words of the Liturgy, "Ite, *Missa* est."

the ascendancy it held in the thirteenth century without protest and opposition.

Wicliffe and those who came after him were far from being the earliest upholders of a purer worship and more evangelical doctrine.

In the eleventh century Berengarius, a dignitary of the French Church, with whatever vacillation and with however little success, had so opposed the then prevalent doctrine of transubstantiation and of an objective and material presence of Christ in the elements, that he drew down upon himself synodical condemnations and was only rescued from the death of a heretic by the friendship, perhaps the sympathy, of Hildebrand. To say nothing of the opposition, on this question, between the followers of Thomas Aquinas and the disciples of Scotus, the doctrine of transubstantiation, on its first promulgation by Paschasius about A. D. 830, met with no feeble rejoinder from Ratramnus or Bertram, who, in his treatise on the body and blood of the Lord, insisted upon the difference between the sign and the thing signified, the figure and the reality. He urged that the proper end and object of the sacramental mysteries is that men's minds may, by their means, rise from the outward and visible to the inward and invisible. He pointed out that, if Christ's body could be eaten after a material and objective fashion, there would be no exercise of faith, but an employment of the senses only, in such an act. He did not deny that the elements were changed by the eucharistic blessing so that, after that blessing, they were the body and blood of Christ—(observe how the exclusive remembrance of the abridged form, This is My blood, and the ignoring of the more spiritual and fuller form, This cup is the new covenant in My blood, wrought even in such a

man as Bertram)—but he insisted that the change was subjective, in the thought and feeling of the recipient, as had been taught by the earliest Christian writers.

G. *The Lord's Supper gradually converted into "The Mass."*

This doctrine of the subjective presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacramental bread and wine, and Bertram's reference to ancient writers, may serve to carry us back from the ninth century to the age of certain much earlier Christian authors.

We have seen that in some of their writings are to be found the beginnings, or something more than the beginnings, of a departure from the simplicity that was in the apostolic "breaking of bread."

They unfortunately lost sight of the duplicate record of our Saviour's words. For them, generally and practically, Christ might never have said, This cup is the new covenant in My blood. For them, in their ordinary mode of thinking and writing, this fuller utterance of the Lord —this only authentic exposition of what the Evangelists meant when they ascribed to their Master the words, This is My blood of the covenant—might never have been spoken by Christ, might never have been written by St. Luke and St. Paul.

For them, as completely as for too many modern Christians, the only words that constantly adhered to their memory, and habitually moulded their conceptions of the Lord's Supper, were an abridgment of an abridgment. Rarely do they mention the words, This is My blood of the covenant. Even this abbreviated form is, by the Fathers, almost invariably abbreviated still further into, This is My blood, as parallel with the other abbreviation, This is My body.

This abbreviation of our Lord's words, and this unintentional, but most deplorable, ignoring of His fuller statement, which contained the unmistakable meaning of His words, were, we cannot doubt, the cause—the first and originating cause—of all the wide difference that separates "the breaking of bread at home," as practised by the apostles, from the sacrifice of the Mass offered by the priest alone in the chancel of the mediæval Church.

But it must not be thought that the change, whose seed lay in the ignoring of Christ's words and their proper signification by Justin, and possibly by Ignatius, sprang at once into full development. Slowly there grew up the practice of a morning Supper, of only a morning Supper, of a morning Supper to be partaken of fasting. Slowly, from the New Testament abstinence from calling the Supper in any sense a sacrifice, there grew the usage of designating the prayers and thanksgivings, and even the elements of the Supper, a sacrifice. From all Christians, as families or as assemblies, breaking bread together without a trace of priestly intervention, except by Christ Himself, there grew up the notion that all Christians engaged in this rite in their capacity of a royal priesthood offering spiritual sacrifice unto God. Then came a confusion between making a gift to the brethren of things required for the love-feast, and making an oblation to God of those same provisions for the love-feast and for the communion of the Lord's Supper.

Then, as the bread and wine came to be identified (at first figuratively and spiritually, in after ages literally and materially) with Christ's body and blood, there gradually crept in the idea that the objective flesh and blood of Jesus were, from celebration to celebration, repeatedly sacrificed in the Church. From the body and blood of

Christ having been once for all given upon the cross to put away sin, there sprang, in later times, the notion that the oft-repeated sacrifice of the Mass was effectual, not only to procure pardon for sinners upon earth, but also for the remission of penalties suffered by souls in purgatory.

The Table of the Lord came to be called the altar. To distinguish the ministers at that altar from their fellow-priests, the entire congregation of Christians, there was superinduced an ignoring of the truth that every Christian is a priest; and there was brought in the erroneous idea that some Christians, those, namely, who administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in particular, were priests above their fellow-Christians. The latter were the "laity" (merely a Greek term for the people), and the former came to be alone designated as "priests."

All these changes, and many others connected with them—such as the introduction, on certain occasions, of public confession by notorious sinners and their public readmission to Church privileges; and, in the dark ages, the substitution for this public discipline of private (or auricular) confession and sacerdotal absolution as an indispensable preliminary to communion—these changes sprang up gradually, through the decades and through the centuries, and made the mediæval Mass to be a rite wide as the poles asunder from the original "breaking of bread" as instituted by Christ and practised by the apostles.

The whole complication of such changes, however, had their seed and germ and root in the misconception which not only abridged our Lord's words into This is My blood, but interpreted even that abridged form in senses any and all of which would have been negatived and contradicted

by the fuller statement of Christ's words, This cup is the new covenant in My blood.

H. *Opposing and Spiritual Principles laid down by the Greatest of the Fathers.*

As these changes were gradually introduced, some of them coloring the pages of Justin if not of Ignatius, not a few of them observable in the earliest Liturgies, which probably come to us from the fourth or fifth—possibly from the third—centuries, there were misgivings and oppositions in the minds of those believers who felt them to be not only innovations but errors.

It is not our intention to give instances of protest against such errors and innovations in detail; but there are some general principles supplied by men, among the Fathers themselves, who have been ever the most influential and the most universally as well as highly esteemed; and these principles must not be altogether overlooked by us.

One of these important and fundamental truths bears the interpretation of expression used by the Fathers themselves. These principles may be sufficiently exemplified in the following words of Augustine:

If the sacraments bore no resemblance to those things of which they are sacraments, they would not possess the nature of sacraments at all. From this resemblance, however, the sacraments are very frequently called by the names of the things of which they are sacraments." Thus, "after a fashion,[1] the sacrament [or outward sign] of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ."—Ep. ad Bonifac., ep. 98.

[1] Secundum quemdam modum.

Again, "Everything which is a sign of another thing seems, after a fashion,[1] to be personified as that other thing: just as the apostle said, That rock was Christ, because the rock spoken of was indeed a sign of Christ."—Aug. De Civ. Dei, Book xviii. ch. 48.

And yet again, "A thing which is a sign is wont to be called by the name of the thing of which it is a sign: and so it is written, The seven ears are seven years; for it is not said, They signify seven years: and the seven kine are seven years; and there are many examples of the same kind. . . For it is not said, The rock signifies Christ, but words are used as if the rock was that which in substance it is not, but which it only signifies; and similarly blood, because (on account of a kind of vital substance in it) it is a sign of life, is, in sacramental language, called life."—Aug. Quæst. in Levit. Book iii. Qu. 57.

And, in another place,[2] Augustin tells us that the object of this interchange of names, between the sign and the thing signified, is that when we look upon the sign—the bread or wine, for instance—we may be reminded by the change of names of the things signified, and our minds may be lifted up to contemplate that which is higher than the sign—the gift, for instance, of Christ's body and blood for us and for all the world.

Here, then, at the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth, we have a most important principle laid down that, in speaking of the sacraments, the Christian custom was to call the sign by the name of the thing signified—to call bread the flesh of Christ, and wine His blood—not from any confusion in the minds of those who

[1] Quodam modo.

[2] Ideo enim mutata sunt nomina, ut ad mysterii significationem nos excitaret mutatio nominum. Aug. in Psalm xxxiii., Sermo 1, § 7.

so spoke ; not because they believed there was any material and objective presence of Christ in or with the bread and wine ; not because they culpably failed to discern the Lord's body in heaven, or His body the Church, as distinct and different from the signs or symbols, bread and wine ;—not from any such careless and materializing error as this, but because, fully recognizing that bread and wine were only signs, and flesh and blood, or the covenant ratified by flesh and blood, was the thing signified, therefore they called the palpably unchanged symbols by the name of the holy things they signified, in order that men's hearts might thereby be the more certainly elevated to the heavenly meaning of the earthly symbols.

The subsequent history of the Church has shown how lamentably perilous was this practice of designating sacramental signs by the names of those holier things which they signified ; but it is most instructive and most satisfactory to find, from the distinct and often repeated testimony of one of the very greatest of Western theologians, that this usage was far indeed from originally denoting a confusion in the minds of Christians between the sign and the thing signified—that, these two objects being quite distinct from one another, the anxiety of those who called the one (the sign) by the name of the other (the thing signified), was to draw away the attention of worshippers from the lower (the sign, the bread and wine) to the higher (the thing signified, the body and blood of Christ).

From these passages we learn how far Augustin was from believing there was any objective presence of the Lord in the eucharistic elements : and we also learn that, so far as he was a competent interpreter of Ignatius, or

Justin, or Cyprian, and the other great writers who had preceded him, he wished them to be understood, not as materializing in bread and wine the presence of God who is a Spirit, but as doing their utmost to lift men's thoughts above the local and material limits of bread and wine, into association with that eternal Son who, though a Spirit, did, while He tabernacled in flesh on the earth, give His body and His blood for the putting away of the sins of the whole world, and so ratified a new covenant betwixt God and man, and instituted a new communion between man and man, as well as between man and Christ and God.

Here, then, is the first principle for the interpretation of sacramental language, as laid down by that Augustin who, among patristic writers, hardly had a superior.

When the sign is called, as it often is, by the name of the thing signified—bread called flesh, the rock called Christ, kine called years, blood called life, wine called blood—do not think there is any change of matter or substance implied; do not think there is any objective presence of the thing signified in the sign; do not suppose there is, or ought to be, any confusion of these things in the mind of an intelligent teacher; but remember that the misnomer is employed for the very purpose of dissociating your attention and your affection from the lower sign, and directing them to the higher thing signified.

If the abridged form, This is My blood, had always been understood in accordance with this maxim of the great Bishop of Hippo, its curtailment would not have wrought the mischief, produced the misunderstanding, called forth the bitterness, generated the superstition, and caused the schism which have resulted from a forgetfulness alike of the New Testament and of Augustin's rule.

It is marvellous that the variety and number of types or things significant of other things, called by the names of those other things, and yet never confounded with those other things, did not preserve the Lord's Supper from this desecration.

It is marvellous that the way in which Scripture varies the type, by comparing Christ's body much more frequently with the multitude of those who believe in Christ than with the eucharistic elements, did not act as a preservative against the idea of a material transformation or an objective presence. Who ever dreams of an assembly of Christians (Scripturally designated as Christ's body) being transmuted into the material substance of Jesus; or of His being objectively and bodily present with them, because spiritually and subjectively He is always with them? Our astonishment, in this respect, is not lessened when we find the early Christian writers adopting this variety of things signified by one and the same sign, and actually carrying it much further than had been done by the Scripture-writers themselves. For instance, in his commentary on 1 Cor. x. 17 (Homil. xxiv. § 2,) in treating of the words, For we, being many, are one bread and one body, Chrysostom writes, "What mean I by the word communion? We are that very body itself; for what is the bread? It is the body of Christ; and what do the communicants become? They become the body of Christ —not many bodies, but one body: for as the bread is made one by the putting together of many grains, so that the grains are nowhere apparent, and yet the grains are there but their individual granular existence is hidden by their union and intermixture, so also we are conjoined with one another and with Christ."

Thus, Chrysostom represents the "body of Christ" to

be the aggregate of believers; and, to the same effect, Augustin (Serm. 272), after stating that Jesus ascended into heaven, and "took up His body thither," presently proceeds, "How is the bread his body? and the cup, or its contents, how are they His blood? These things, brethren, are therefore called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen and another thing is suggested to the mind. That which is seen has a bodily form, that which is suggested to the mind has a spiritual fruit. Now, if you wish to know what is meant by the body of Christ, listen to the apostle saying to believers, Ye are the body of Christ, and His members. If, then, ye are the body and members of Christ, the mystery (or sacrament) of yourselves is placed on the Lord's Table—ye partake the mystery (or sacrament) of yourselves. To that which ye are, ye respond with the Amen, and by responding ye assent to it; for thou hearest the words, The body of Christ, and thou respondest, Amen. Be a member of Christ, that thy Amen may be sincere. . . . And now, what we are to understand respecting the cup is evident without further comment. For, as, in order that there may be the visible form of bread, many grains are moistened into one mass; as that happens which Holy Scripture says of believers, There was in them one soul and one heart towards God; so, also, with respect to the wine. Remember, brethren, from whence comes wine. Many separate grapes hang upon a bunch, but their juice is mingled together into one. So also the Lord Christ hath been our sign or representative, hath wished us to belong to Himself, hath consecrated upon His Table the mystery (or sacrament) of peace and of our oneness."

So, again, quite consistently with this representation of

the aggregate of believers as being the bread and the wine of the Lord's Supper, Augustin says, in another place (Serm. 229), "Because He suffered for us, He commended to us, in that sacrament of yours, His body and His blood which, also, He made even us ourselves to be: for even we are made His body, and, by His mercy, we are what we partake. . . . Now, in the name of Christ, ye are come, as it were, to the cup of the Lord; and there ye are upon the Table; and there ye are in the cup."

Such is the variety of application with which the greatest of the Fathers use this language.

Precisely as they said Christ's flesh was on the Table, and His blood was in the cup, and both were partaken by communicants, so, no less definitely and categorically, did they teach that the aggregate of believers, the entire Church of the faithful, were "on the Lord's Table," were "in the cup," and were there "partaken of" by every communicant.

No one pretends that Chrysostom and Augustin believed there was an objective and material change of all believers into bread and wine, or into the flesh and blood of Jesus. Why, then, should it be thought that the early Fathers believed, any more, in an objective change of the bread and wine into the material body and blood of our Lord? No one pretends that Chrysostom and Augustin believed there was an objective presence of Christ's body and blood always in the entire aggregate of the faithful which they called Christ's body and blood. Why, then, should it be thought that they believed there was an objective presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements which those Fathers similarly, neither more nor less, designated as Christ's body and blood?

Here, then, we arrive at a second principle for the

interpretation of the Fathers:—When, in sacramental language, the body of Christ and His blood are said to be on the Lord's Table and in the cup, and to be received and partaken of by communicants, this is no more to be understood as implying an objective and material presence of Christ in or with the elements, than such an objective and material presence of all Christians is understood when, no less distinctly, we, like grains for the bread, like juice from the bunch of grapes, are all declared to be "on the Lord's Table," "in the cup," "received" by the communicants. If the presence of the Christian multitude in the eucharistic elements is subjective and spiritual, no less subjective and spiritual is the presence of Christ.

And now we pass on to another most important principle, which is laid down by no less a writer than Augustin, for the interpretation of all Scripture, especially of such passages of Holy Writ as are concerned with the eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood.

From Augustin's treatise on Christian Doctrine (Book iii., ch. xvi.) we produce the following words:

"If any precept forbids an evil deed or a crime, or if it enjoins a useful or beneficent action, the language is not figurative. If, however, any precept seems to enjoin an evil action or a crime, or if it seems to forbid a useful or beneficent action, the language is figurative. Except ye eat, it is said, the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. A crime or an evil act seems to be enjoined; the language must therefore be figurative; and the precept really commands us to join one with another in our sympathy with the suffering of our Lord,[1] and to lay up, as a treasure in our memory, the sweet and use-

[1] Præcipiens passioni dominicæ communicandum.

ful recollection that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us."

Apart from Augustin's here adding his weight to the general teaching of the Fathers that the eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood, inculcated in John vi., is not primarily, at all events, sacramental and occasional, but spiritual and habitual—itself no unimportant illustration of the best patristic teaching in connection with the general subject of this essay—we have here a principle of the first importance. If Scripture, still more if any so-called Father, seems to enjoin anything immoral, the language cannot be meant in its literal signification; it can only be intended to be taken figuratively.

This maxim, in its wide sweep, converts every precept that would be murderous, cannibalistic, loathsome, in its literal acceptation, into a figure; and if more incisive definiteness could be given to the maxim, it is added in that Augustin illustrates his principle of interpretation by applying it to words spoken by our Saviour Himself—and those words such as are very often misquoted and misrepresented as if they taught that partaking the eucharistic elements was identical with eating the flesh of Jesus and drinking His blood. Piety and common sense must surely yield their assent to this principle of the great African bishop as soon as it is promulgated and reflected on. There needs no argument or comment in support of it. Its applicability to our subject is pointed out by its author himself. We leave it in its grand simplicity to convert into the richness of figurative and spiritual significance every mention, in Scripture and elsewhere, of eating the flesh of Christ or drinking His blood.

For such passages in the Fathers, for such arguments in the pages of Paschasius, for such decrees of councils

—whether of the Fourth Lateran or of Trent—or for such modern attempts to resuscitate mediæval ideas, as are irreconcilable with its sage teaching, this maxim of Augustin must always remain as a solemn confutation and rebuke. There can be no literal and objective eating of Christ's body, or drinking His blood, even in the eucharistic bread and wine, because such an act would be evil and criminal.

So, then, we have three great principles of interpretation supplied to us by the Fathers themselves:

1. It is a common practice to call a symbol by the name of that which it symbolizes without intending to imply any identity of matter or substance between the sign and the thing signified, but only to draw attention to some resemblance or analogy between the two, and especially to direct the reader's mind to the superior importance and interest of the thing signified over its sign. Thus, eucharistic bread and wine are often called the body and blood of Christ, not with any idea of material and objective identity between the elements and Christ, but because there is a resemblance of relations between them, the former nourishing men's bodies and the latter nourishing their souls; and again, there is a hallowed association of thought and feeling, enjoined by Christ Himself, in accordance with which participation in bread and wine should always deepen our grateful sense of communion in the new covenant of love and righteousness ratified by the giving of Christ's body and the shedding of His blood.

2. Our second principle is, The patristic language which thus calls the symbol by the name of the thing signified is so far from being intended to be taken literally, is so thoroughly figurative, that it often varies the metaphor so as, in connection with eucharistic bread and

wine, not only to call them Christ's flesh and blood, but to employ them as proper designations for the whole company of Christians.

3. And then our third principle is, Wherever any language, even in the holiest of books, would involve us, if taken literally, in evil or criminal deeds, we must understand such language as figurative; and this with special reference to phrases which speak of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood. The literal sense is here abhorrent and criminal, and therefore only a figurative interpretation is admissible.

I. *Translation of the Salisbury Mass-Book.*

And now, from these dominating principles of patristic and eucharistic interpretation, we proceed to lay before the reader a translation of the Latin Mass-book such as it had come to be in England, in the fifteenth and early part of the sixteenth centuries. There were many such Mass-books prevailing in different portions of the Church. That which was in use over a great part of England, and which became to a considerable extent the basis for the English Reformed Liturgy, was the Mass-book of Salisbury, the Sarum Missal; and it is that which we propose now to render into English as an example of what was then the embodiment and substitute for the simple "breaking of bread" of the apostolic Church.

The Order and Rule[1] of the Mass according to the Usage of the Church of Salisbury.

While the priest[2] *puts on the sacred vestments for the purpose of saying Mass, let him repeat the hymn,*

Come, Thou creative Spirit.
Send forth Thy Spirit:
And Thou shalt refresh the face of the earth.

Prayer.

God, unto whom every heart is open and every desire speaketh, and from whom no secret is hidden; cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by pouring into them Thy Holy Spirit; so that we may merit[3] to love Thee perfectly and praise Thee worthily. Through Christ.

Then let the Antiphon follow,

I will go unto the altar.

The Psalm.

Judge me, O God (Psalm 43).

Then is said the Antiphon,

I will go unto the altar of God, to God who maketh glad my youth.
Lord, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.
Our Father, etc.

Hail, Mary, thou that art highly favored; the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus.

When these rites are ended, and the office otherwise called the anthem or the introit) of the Mass is begun, at the first words of the "Glory be to the Father," *etc., after the office, let the priest, with his attendants,*[4] *approach the step of the altar; and with the deacon standing by him on his right hand, and the sub-deacon on his left, let him say his own confession, beginning after this manner:*

And lead us not into temptation,
But deliver us from evil.
Confess ye unto the Lord, for He is good:
For His mercy is from generation to generation.

[1] "Canon," a rule.

[2] "Sacerdos," a sacrificing priest, as opposed to "Presbyter" (an elder), from which, by abbreviations, in different times and countries, are derived Preostre (Saxon), Priester (German), Prêtre (French), and Priest (English); so that, derivatively and properly, the English word "priest" has nothing to do with the idea of *sacrificing*, but is simply an abbreviation for the Greek word "Presbyter," which signifies an *Elder*, comparative of *Presbys*, old.

[3] "ut mereamur," that we may deserve, gain, attain; but with the idea of merit conspicuous in every signification of the word.

[4] Cum suis ministris.

I confess to God, to blessed Mary, to all the saints, and [*turning towards the choir*] to you: I have sinned, too much, in thought, word, and deed, by my own fault. [*Then, looking to the altar*] I entreat the holy Mary and all the saints of God, and [*looking to the choir*] you, to pray for me.

Then the choir, looking at the priest, respond,

The Lord be merciful.

Then the choir, turning to the altar, make their confession, as did the priest. Then the priest gives the Absolution:

May Almighty God have mercy upon you, and put away from you all your sins: deliver you from all evil: preserve and confirm you in all goodness: and lead you to eternal life. Amen.

May the Almighty and Merciful God grant you absolution and remission of all your sins, opportunity for true penitence,[1] amendment of life, and grace and comfort of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Then shall the priest say,

Our help is in the name of the Lord.

Choir. Who made heaven and earth.

Priest. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

Choir. From this time forth and for evermore.

Let us pray.

Then, Prayers being ended, let the priest kiss the deacon and, afterwards, the subdeacon, saying,

Receive the kiss of peace and love, that ye may be fit to perform the divine services of the holy altar.

These duties having been thus performed, let the candle-bearers set down the candlesticks with the candles at the step of the altar; then let the priest go to the altar, and let him say, in the middle of the altar, with a low voice and with body bowed and hands joined,

Let us pray.

Take from us, O Lord, all our iniquities, that with pure minds we may merit to enter the holy of holies. Through Christ.

Then let the priest raise himself and kiss the altar in its midst, and let him cross[2] *himself on the face and say,*

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Then let the deacon put incense into the censer, having first said to the priest,

Bless [this].

And let the priest say,

Lord, may it be sanctified by Thyself, in whose honour it shall be burned. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

[1] Spatium veræ pœnitentiæ. [2] Signet se.

Then let the deacon, as he delivers the censer to the priest, kiss his hand; and let the priest cense the middle of the altar and each of its corners,[1] first on the right, then in the middle, and then on the left. Then let the priest be censed by the deacon; and afterwards let him kiss the scripture-book.[2] . . . *Then let the ministers (or attendants) draw near, in order, to the altar, first the two candle-bearers walking together, then the incense-bearers, then the sub-deacon, next the deacon, after him the priest. . . . And when this has been done, let the priest and his attendants betake themselves to the seats prepared for them, and let them wait [thus, till the* "Glory be to God on high," *and let that, whenever it is said, be begun at the middle of the altar.*

Glory be to God on high; and in earth peace to men of good will. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.

O Lord, the only begotten Son Jesu Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father; Thou who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou who takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer.[3] Thou who sittest at the right hand of the Father, have mercy upon us.

For Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord; Thou only, O Jesu Christ, art most high, with the Holy Spirit, in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

. . These things ended, and having made the sign of the cross on his face, let the priest turn himself to the people, and raising his arms a little and joining his hands, let him say,

The Lord be with you.

Let the choir respond.

And with thy spirit.

Let the priest again turn towards the altar and say,

Let us pray.

Then the Prayer is said. And if there be any special[4] *Prayer, let the priest again say,* Let us pray, *as before. And when there are several Collects to be said, then all the Prayers which follow are begun with one* Let us pray, *and ended with a single* Through our Lord: *so, however, that not more than seven Collects be thus blended together, according to the custom of the Church at Salisbury. . . . After the introit of the Mass, let one of the candle-bearers bring the bread and wine and water, which have been set aside for the service of the Eucharist; and let the other bring a basin of water and a towel. . . . At the beginning of the last Collect before the Epistle, let the sub-deacon go through the midst of the choir, to the pulpit, to read the Epistle. . . . While the Epistle is being read, let two boys, in surplices,* [*pass*] *through the midst of the choir towards the pulpit, and having bowed towards the altar, on the step of the choir, let them be ready to begin the "Gradual" and to chant their verse. While the verse of the "Gradual" is being sung, let two, in a higher position,*[5] *put on silken copes, to chant the "Alleluia," and let them go through the midst of the choir near to the pulpit. Let the "Alleluia" come next. After the "Alleluia" let the "Sequence" follow. And at the end of the "Alleluia" or "Sequence" or "Tractus,"*[6] *let the deacon, before going to read the Gospel, cense the middle of the altar only. . . . Then, let him take the scripture-book, that is,*

[1] Utrumque cornu, each horn.

[2] Textum. "Textum" is subsequently defined as "the book of the Gospels."

[3] Deprecationem.

[4] Si aliqua memoria habenda est.

[5] De superiori gradu.

[6] An anthem so called.

the book of the Gospels, and, bowing to the priest who stands in front of the altar, with his face towards the south,[1] let him say,

Bid, sir, that I bless.

Let the priest reply,

The Lord be in thy heart and in thy mouth for utterance of the holy Gospel of God. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

*And so let the deacon go through the midst of the choir, reverently bearing the scripture-book in his left hand, and let him go to the pulpit, preceded by the incense-bearer and the candle-bearer. . . . And let the Gospel always be read towards the north.[2] And when he begins the Gospel, after "*The Lord be with you,*" let him make the sign of the cross with his thumb upon the book, then on his forehead, then on his breast.*

The Gospel according to [etc.].

The Gospel ended, let the priest, in the middle of the altar, begin,

I believe in one God [etc.].

After that:

The Lord be with you.

Let us pray.

Then is said the "Offertory."[3] After the "Offertory" let the deacon give to the priest the cup (or chalice), together with the paten (or plate) and the sacrifice; and on each occasion let him kiss the priest's hand. Let the priest, as he receives the cup from the deacon, carefully set it in its appointed place upon the middle of the altar; and, bearing himself somewhat, let him lift the cup with both hands and offer it as a sacrifice to God, while he says this Prayer:

Receive, holy Trinity, this offering[4] which I, an unworthy sinner, offer in honour of Thee, of blessed Mary, and of all Thy saints, for my sins and offences, and for the salvation of the living and the repose of all the faithful dead. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. May this new sacrifice[5] be accepted by Almighty God.

This Prayer ended, let the priest replace the cup and cover it with the ceremonials;[6] and let him decorously place the bread upon the ceremonials in front of the cup which contains the wine and the water, and let him kiss the paten and replace it, on the right of the sacrifice, upon the altar, partially under cover of the ceremonials. When this is done, let him receive the censer from the deacon, and let him cense the sacrifice . . . and whilst censing it, let him say,

Let my prayer, O Lord, be directed towards Thee like as the incense in Thy sight.

Then let the priest himself be censed . . . and, these things having been thus performed let the priest go to the right corner of the altar, and let him wash his hands while he says,

Cleanse me, Lord, from all impurity of my heart and body, that I may purely perform the holy work of the Lord.

[1] Versâ facie ad meridiem. [2] Versus aquilonem.

[3] The *offertorium* was a verse, which was sung at this point in the Liturgy; and during its continuance the people made their offerings.

[4] Oblationem. [5] Novum sacrificium. [6] Corporalia, body-clothes.

Then let him return, and standing before the altar, with head and body bowed, and with joined hands, let him say,

In the spirit of humility and with a contrite mind may we be received, O Lord, by Thee; and may our sacrifice be offered in Thy sight that it may be accepted this day, and may be pleasing to Thee, O Lord my God.

Then, raising himself, let the priest kiss the altar on the right of the sacrifice; and giving the Benediction over the sacrifice,[1] *let him cross himself and say,*

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Then let the priest turn towards the people, and say in a low voice,[2]

Pray, brothers and sisters, for me, that my sacrifice, which is yours also,[3] may be accepted by the Lord our God.

Then shall the clergy respond quietly,[4]

May the grace of the Holy Spirit illumine thy hearts and tips; and may the Lord receive meetly[5] (or worthily) this sacrifice of praise at thy hands, for our sins and offences.

Then let the priest return to the altar and say his private[6] *prayers according to the number and arrangement of those set forth above before the Epistle, beginning thus,*

Let us pray.

And, when his prayers are ended, let the priest say audibly,

For ever and ever;

Without raising his hands, however, till he says,

Lift up your hearts.

And then let the sub-deacon receive the Offertory and the paten at the hand of the deacon. . . .

After this manner shall all Prefaces to the Mass be begun every day throughout the year, as well on week-days as on festivals:

For ever and ever. Amen.
The Lord be with you.
And with thy spirit.

Here let the priest lift up his hands, whilst saying,

Lift up your hearts.
We lift them up unto the Lord.
Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God.
It is meet and right so to do.

This Preface is to be used every day [when no special Psalm is appointed]:

It is very meet and right, just and salutary, that we should give thanks unto Thee at all times and in all places, Holy Lord, Almighty Father, eternal God, through Christ our Lord; through whom An-

[1] Ultra sacrificium.
[2] Tacita voce.
[3] Meum pariterque vestrum.
[4] Privatim.
[5] Digne.
[6] Secretas orationes.

gels praise Thy Majesty, Dominions worship, Powers tremble. Heavens and the heavenly virtues and the blessed seraphim unite to celebrate Thee exultingly. And, together with them, let our voices be admitted, we beseech Thee, as with suppliant acknowledgment we say,

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth. The heavens and earth are full of Thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

Then, straightway joining his hands and raising his eyes, let the priest begin,

Thee, therefore, most merciful Father, we suppliants beseech and pray [*Here let the priest rise and kiss the altar on the right of the sacrifice while he says*] that Thou wouldst receive and bless these ✠ gifts, these ✠ services,[1] these ✠ holy and unblemished[2] sacrifices.

And when the crosses have been made over the cup, let him raise his hands and say,

In the first place, which we offer for Thy holy Catholic Church, that Thou mayst deign to give it peace, to guard it, to unite it, and to govern it throughout the entire world, together with Thy servant our Pope *M.* or *N.* and together with our president[3] [that is, their own bishop only] and with our king *M.* or *N.*, and with all the orthodox and all them that hold the Catholic and apostolic faith.

Here let the priest pray, while thinking of the living,

Remember, Lord, thy servants and handmaidens, *M.* and *N.*, and all this congregation, whose faith and devotion are known to Thee, for whom we offer, or who themselves offer, to Thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves and for all their connections, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their safety and salvation ; and to Thee, the Eternal God, the Living and the True, they bring their vows:

Whilst we are in fellowship with, and venerate the memory of, first, glorious Mary ever virgin, mother of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ; but also the memory of Thy blessed apostles and martyrs, Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon, and Thaddeus; Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damianus; and all Thy saints; and to their merits and prayers do Thou grant that in all things we may be defended by the aid of Thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let the priest look with great reverence towards the host,[4] and say,

This offering of the service of us and of Thy whole family, we be-

[1] Munera. [2] Illibata. [3] Antistite.
[4] Hostia, a victim, or sacrifice slain.

seech Thee, Lord, that Thou being reconciled[1] wilt accept; keep our days in Thy peace; and grant[2] that we, being rescued from eternal perdition, may be numbered with the flock of Thine elect. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here, again, let him look towards the host, and say,

And this oblation do Thou, Almighty God, we beseech Thee, deign to make in all things bless✠ed, de✠voted,[3] rati✠fied, reasonable, and acceptable, so that it may become,[4] to us the bo✠dy and bl✠ood of Thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ:

Here let the priest lift up his hands and join them; and then let him wipe his fingers, and while elevating the host, let him say,

Who, the day before He suffered, took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and lifting up his eyes to heaven [*Here let the priest raise his eyes*], to Thee, His Almighty God and Father, [*Here let the priest bow, and then, slightly raising himself, let him proceed*] gave thanks to Thee, and bless✠ed, and brake, [*Here let the priest touch the host while he says*] and gave to His disciples, saying, Take and eat of this, all of you; for this is My body.

These words ought to be spoken at one breath and with one utterance, without a pause. After these words let the priest bow towards the host; then let him elevate it above his forehead, that it may be seen by the people; and then let him reverently replace it before the cup after the form of a cross has been made by it. And then let him uncover the cup and hold it in his hands, without separating the thumb from the first finger, except while he gives the blessing only: and let him thus say,

Likewise, after supper, He took this glorious cup into His sacred and venerable hands; and, giving thanks [*Here let the priest bow and say*] to Thee, He bless✠ed, and gave to His disciples, saying, Take and drink of it, all of you;[5] [*Here let the priest elevate the cup a little and say*] for this is the cup of My blood, of the new and eternal covenant, the mystery of the faith, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. [*Here let the priest elevate the cup as high as his breast or above his head, saying*] As oft as ye do these things, ye shall do them in memory of Me.

Here let the priest replace the cup, and let him raise his arms after the fashion of a cross, the fingers joined till the words, "of Thy gifts."

Wherefore also, O Lord, we Thy servants, together with all Thy holy people, mindful of the blessed passion of the same Christ, Thy Son our Lord; mindful also of His resurrection from the lower[6] regions, and of His glorious ascension into the heavens; offer to Thy excellent[7] majesty of Thy gifts and bounties, a pu✠re host, a sa✠cred host, an imma✠culate host; the sa✠cred bread of eternal life and the c✠up of perpetual salvation.

[1] Placatus. [2] Jubeas. [3] Ascriptam. [4] Ut nobis . . . fiat.
[5] Bibite ex eo omnes. [6] Ab inferis. [7] Præclaræ.

And upon these deign to look with propitious and serene counte nance; and to accept them like as Thou didst deign to accept the offerings of Thy righteous child Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and the offering of Thy high-priest Melchisedek, a sacred sacrifice, a spotless host.

Here let the priest, with body bowed and hands interlaced, say,

We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command that these things may be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thine altar on high,[1] in sight of Thy divine majesty; so that as many of us [*Here let the priest raise himself and kiss the altar on the right of the sacrifice, and say*] as have, in this participation at the altar, received the sacred bo✠dy and bl✠ood of Thy Son, may [*Here let the priest cross himself on the face and say.*] be filled with all heavenly bene✠diction and grace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let the priest pray for the dead.

Remember, also, O Lord, the souls of Thy servants and handmaidens, *M.* and *N.*, who have gone before us with the sign of the faith, and who sleep the sleep of peace. For them, O Lord, and for all who rest in Christ, we pray for Thine indulgence[2] in the place of cooling, light, and peace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let the priest smite his breast once and say,

To us sinners, also, Thy servants whose hope is in the multitude of Thy mercies, deign to give some part and association with Thy holy apostles and martyrs; with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and all Thy saints; and into their company admit us, we beseech Thee, not weighing merit but bestowing pardon.[3] Through Christ our Lord; through whom, O Lord, Thou ever createst all these good things, [*Here let the priest make the sign of the cross three times over the cup, and say*] Thou sancti✠fiest them, Thou vivi✠fiest them, Thou bless✠est them, and bestowest them upon us. [*Here let the priest uncover the cup and make the sign of the cross with the host five times*] Through H✠im, and with H✠im, and in H✠im, is all honor and glory to Thee, God the Father Al✠mighty, in the unity of the Holy ✠ Spirit, [*Here let the priest cover the cup and keep his hands upon the altar until the Lord's Prayer is said*] for ever and ever. Amen.

[1] In sublime altare tuum.

[2] Locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur.

[3] Non æstimator meriti, sed veniæ largitor.

Let us pray.

Admonished by Thy saving precepts, and fashioned[1] by the divine institution, we are bold to say—

Here let the deacon receive the paten and hold it uncovered, on the right of the priest, with his arm held out upwards, until the Prayer, "Grant propitiously," *etc., is said.*

Here let the priest raise his hands and say,

Our Father, etc. . . . Lead us not into temptation.

Let the choir respond,

But deliver us from evil.

The priest says by himself,[2]

Amen.

Deliver us, we pray Thee, Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come; and, by the intercession of blessed and glorious Mary, ever virgin, mother of God, and by the intercession of Thy blessed apostles Peter and Paul and Andrew, and all Thy saints—

Here let the deacon give the paten to the priest, whose hand he shall kiss, and let the priest kiss the paten; then let him raise it to his left eye, then to his right; then let him make a cross with the paten above his head: and then let him replace it in its proper place, saying—

Grant propitiously peace in our days, so that, assisted by the help of Thy mercy, we may both be always free from sin and also safe from all disquietude.

Here let the priest uncover the cup, and, while bowing, let him take the body and, holding it over the bowl of the cup between his thumbs and forefingers, let him break it into three portions, saying meanwhile,

Through the same our Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son.

(*Second breaking.*) Who liveth and reigneth with Thee, God, in the unity of the Holy Spirit;

Here let the priest hold the two fragments in his left hand, and the third fragment in his right, over the top of the cup, saying as follows with an audible voice,

For ever and ever. Amen.

Here let him make three crosses, within the cup, with the third portion of the host, saying,

The peace of the L✠ord be e✠ver with ✠ you.

Let the choir respond,

And with thy spirit.

For the saying of the "Agnus," let the deacon and sub-deacon both come near to the priest, on his right hand, the deacon next him, the sub-deacon further off; and let them say, each by himself,[3]

Lamb of God, which takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us.

[1] Divina institutione formati. [2] Privatim. [3] Privatim.

Lamb of God, which takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us.

Lamb of God, which takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us.

Here let the priest make the sign of the cross over the above-mentioned third portion of the host, and let him put it into the sacrament of the blood, saying thus,

May this sa✠cred mixture of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be made to me, and to all who receive it, health[1] of mind and body, and a salutary preparation for meriting[2] and receiving eternal life. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Before the giving of the "Pax," let the priest say,

O Lord, holy Father, Almighty and Eternal God, grant me so worthily to receive this sacred body and blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that by this I may merit to obtain[3] remission of all my sins, and to be filled with Thy Holy Spirit, and to have Thy peace. For Thou art God, and there is none other beside Thee, whose glorious kingdom abideth for ever and ever. Amen.

Here let the priest kiss the right side of the cerements[4] and the top of the cup, and then the deacon, and let him say,

Peace be with thee and with the Church of God.

Response. And with thy spirit.

Let the deacon, on the right of the priest, receive from him the "Pax,"[5] and hand it to the sub-deacon; then let the deacon carry the Pax to the step of the choir, to the leaders of the choir; and let these carry the Pax to the choir, each to his own side, beginning with the eldest. After the giving of the Pax let the priest say the following Prayers by himself,[6] before he communicates, holding the host meanwhile in his two hands.

O God the Father, Fountain and Source of all goodness, who, led by mercy, wast willing that Thine only begotten should for us descend into the lowest parts of the world[7] and should take flesh which I, unworthily, hold here in my hands; [*Here let the priest bow to the host while saying*] Thee I adore, Thee I glorify, Thee with the whole purpose of my heart I praise: and I pray that Thou wilt not forsake us Thy servants, but that Thou wilt put away our sins; so that, with pure heart and chaste body, we may merit[8] to serve Thee, the only living and true God. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

O Lord Jesu Christ, Son of the Living God, who, according to the will of the Father, with the co-operation of the Holy Spirit, hast given life to the world by Thy death; deliver me, by this sacred body and this Thy blood, from all mine iniquities and from every evil:

[1] Salus. [2] Promerendam. [3] Ut merear accipere.
[4] Corporalia. [5] The "Pax" was a picture of Christ. [6] Privatim.
[7] Ad infima mundi. [8] Mereamur.

and make me always to obey Thy commands: and suffer me never throughout eternity[1] to be separated from Thee, who, with God the Father and with the same Holy Spirit, livest and reignest God for ever and ever. Amen.

O Lord Jesu, may the sacrament of Thy body and blood, which though unworthy I receive, be not to me for judgment and condemnation, but by Thy goodness[2] may it be profitable for the salvation of my body and soul. Amen.

Let the priest, with lowliness, address the body, before receiving it,

Hail, for ever, holiest flesh of Christ, to me before all things and above all things highest and sweetest.[3] May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ be to me the way and the life. In the name of the ✠ Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Here let the priest take the body, having first made a cross with the body itself in front of his mouth. Then, with great devotion, let him say to the blood,

Hail for ever, heavenly draught, to me before all things and above all things highest and sweetest. May the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be profitable unto me a sinner as a perpetual medicine for eternal life. Amen. In the name of the ✠ Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Here let the priest take the wine; and after taking it let him bow down and say with devotion the following Prayer:

I render thanks to Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, who hast refreshed[4] me by the most sacred body and blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ: and I pray that this sacrament of our salvation, which I an unworthy sinner have received, may not come[5] to me for judgment and condemnation on account of my deservings, but may be for the advancement of my body and soul unto life eternal. Amen.

And when this has been said, let the priest go to the right corner of the altar with the cup in his hands, his fingers still joined as before, and let the sub-deacon draw near and pour wine and water into the cup; and let the priest rinse[6] his hands lest any relics of the body or the blood remain upon his fingers or in the cup. . . . After the first washing or outpouring this Prayer is said:

That which we have received with the mouth, O God, may we take with a pure mind; and of the temporal gift may there be made unto us an eternal medicine.

Here let the priest wash his fingers in the hollow of the cup with the wine that was poured in by the sub-deacon; and, when it has been drained,[7] let this Prayer follow:

May this communion, O Lord, cleanse us from guilt and make us to be partakers of the heavenly medicine.

[1] Nunquam in perpetuum. [2] Tuâ pietate. [3] Summa dulcedo.
[4] Refecisti. [5] Veniat. [6] Resinceret.
[7] Quo hausto—and when it has been quite drunk up.

After taking the ablutions, let the priest set the cup upon the paten in order that, if aught remain, it may drop out; and then, bowing himself, let him say,

Let us adore the sign of the cross by which we have received the sacrament of salvation.

Then let the priest wash his hands; the deacon meanwhile folding up the cerements. The washing of hands ended, and the priest returning to the right corner of the altar, let the deacon hold the cup to the priest's mouth, in case any of that which was poured in should still remain to be consumed. Then, after that, let the priest, with his attendants, say the "Communion." [1]

Then, having made the sign of the cross on his face, let the priest turn himself towards the people, and, with his arms slightly raised and hands joined, let him say,

The Lord be with you.

And, again turning to the altar, let him say,

Let us pray.

Then let him say the post-Communions according to the number and order of the Prayers prescribed above to be said before the Epistle. And when the last post-Communion is ended, and the sign of the cross has been made on his forehead, let the priest again turn to the people and say,

The Lord be with you.

Then the deacon (says),

Let us bless the Lord.

Sometimes, however, the words spoken are—

Go: (the congregation) is dismissed.[2]

As often, however, as the form "Go, the congregation is dismissed," shall be employed, it is always to be spoken by the priest turning towards the people; and when the proper form shall be, "Let us bless the Lord," or "Let him rest in peace," this is said facing towards the altar. After these words, let the priest, with bowed body and joined hands, in a low voice, say this Prayer in front of the middle of the altar:

May the devotion of my service [3] be pleasing to Thee, O holy Trinity; and grant that this sacrifice, which I unworthy have offered in the sight of Thy majesty, may be acceptable to Thee, and may be a propitiation for me and for all on whose behalf I have offered it, through Thy mercy. Who livest and reignest God, for ever and ever. Amen.

And when this is ended, let the priest arise and, crossing himself on the face, say,

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

And so, after bowing, let them return, surrounded by the candle-bearers and the other attendants, in the same order in which they approached the altar at the beginning of Mass. And immediately after (the words) "I render thanks to God," *let there be begun in the choir the "Ninth Hour," when it is said after Mass. But let the priest, as he returns, say the Gospel* [In the beginning was the Word, etc.].

[1] The "Communion" was a verse, taken from one or other of the Psalms, to be chanted at this time.

[2] Ite, missa est. This participle, "*missa*," came to be used as a noun or name for the whole Communion Service of which it had been the end. This is, of course, the derivative origin of the word "Mass."

[3] Obsequium servitutis meæ.

So ended the service of the Mass according to the usage of Salisbury. We have omitted a few rubrics and some special prefaces for particular seasons. Otherwise the ordinary Mass of Sarum is here literally translated.

J. *Comments on the Salisbury Mass-Book.*

And now it will be necessary to comment, as briefly as possible, upon the salient characteristics of this service, and especially upon any marked points of resemblance or contrast between it and the earliest descriptions of the Lord's Supper as they come to us from the New Testament or from Justin Martyr.

1. *Change of Name.*

At the very outset it is remarkable that, instead of using any of the numerous terms employed in Scripture and in the times nearest the apostolic age, such as Breaking of bread, Lord's Supper, Communion, Eucharist, Sacrament, this Use of Salisbury designates the sacred service of the Lord's Table as "The Mass."

It has been sometimes attempted to show that this term is derived from the Hebrew word, "Missah," signifying a "number."[1] We can attach no weight to this somewhat forced and far-fetched derivation. Ambrose, towards the close of the fourth century, is said to be among the earliest of those who introduced the word "Mass" as a name for the Lord's Supper; and assuredly we should look for a Latin phrase, on the tongue of the great Bishop of

[1] Those who adopt this derivation of the word "Mass," support it by reference to Deut. xvi 10, where the Hebrew word is, not "Missah," a noun signifying "number," but *Missath*, a proposition (as Gesenius shows) signifying "at the rate of, even as." Thus, if "Mass" were derived from the Hebrew, its root idea would require to be, not sacrifice, but number, proportion, and would be as remote as possible from the notion of sacrifice. Other considerations, showing that the idea of sacrifice has no proper place in the meaning of the word Mass, are well stated by Bingham in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," Book xiii., ch. i, § 4.

Milan, much more readily and naturally than for a word derived from the Hebrew. Be that as it may, however, the changed name for the Christian "breaking of bread" is not without significance.

Here is a new idea made to be most prominent in the service of the Lord's Table. The name "Mass," we take it, is obviously derived from *Ite, missa est*, "Go, you are dismissed;" and it was, at first, a name applied not only to the Eucharist for communicants, but to all services of the Church, even to those which were open to catechumens or candidates for baptism, and to all other non-communicant members of the congregation.

In process of time, no doubt, the phrase, *Missa catechumenorum*, the Mass or service for non-communicants, was abandoned, and the expression, *Missa fidelium*, the Mass for communicants, remained in use until this service alone came to be designated as "the Mass;" and by that time sacrificial ideas, not of offering prayers, or praises, or gifts as figurative sacrifices, but of offering Christ slain as a victim ("host") upon the altar, were connoted by the term "Mass;" and so, instead of a social breaking of bread with holy remembrance of the Lord's body given, and of His blood shed for us; instead of communion or fellowship with Christ crucified and with the whole body of believers; instead of thanksgiving—men were taught that the most prominent idea of the Lord's Table was to be that of a sacrifice, apparently other than that of Christ's body once offered, apparently different from the spiritual sacrifice of thanksgiving which all Christians were to offer to God in their common and universal character of "priests." The older notion, attached to the word Mass, had been, as we have seen, that of a service, from which part of the congregation was dismissed—the

catechumens, namely, and the excommunicated of the early Church—and so the Mass became a secret service for the initiated only.

Whichever derivation and whatever meaning be adopted for the word "Mass," it can hardly be denied that, in this mediæval word, a new and unscriptural idea of sacrifice, or else a vapid notion of mere change from one congregation to another, is substituted for the Scriptural, simple, and dignified ideas of the breaking of bread, the Lord's Supper, the Communion, the Eucharist, or the Sacrament and vow of military obedience to Christ and fidelity to our fellow-soldiers in the Church. Some may say there is little or nothing in a change of name, but we are disposed to think so pointed an alteration in the title of a religious act is not without grave significance.

At all events, the word "Mass" has become very accurately marked as standing for all the Liturgy and all the rites just set forth above as the Salisbury Missal: and as we know there are cases in which words are of such importance that by them, and by our usage of them, we shall be condemned or justified (Matt. xii. 37), so we are convinced that this substitution of "Mass" for the earlier names of the Eucharist is nowadays, as it was in the middle ages, a matter of grave importance, of deep significance.

2. *Language of Worship, Intelligible or Unintelligible.*

The next point that should be noticed is that, whereas St. Paul was so anxious his words in every service of the Church should be distinct and intelligible, this Latin service of the Mass was, in the sixteenth century—and is still in the unreformed portion of the Western Church—employed for every congregation, in all the countries of

Europe, although vernacular languages had everywhere come into vogue, and the Latin tongue had as universally ceased to be understood by all but the small number of the learned. Here was, assuredly, a practice as irrational as it was unscriptural.

3. *The Terms "Priest," "Altar," "Sacrifice."*

Throughout the whole service of the Mass the "priest"[1] is the most conspicuous figure in every sense of the term; and the constantly recurring mention of the "altar" at which he stands or bends, the frequent reference to the "sacrifice" which on that altar he offers, and the propitiation he is represented as making—all these acts and facts show abundantly that he is no priest, in common with the whole body of the faithful, offering spiritual sacrifices, of prayer and praise only, to God. On the contrary, and in diametrical contravention of Holy Writ, he is intended to be a mediating priest, offering a sacrifice of propitiation to God, and accordingly trenching upon, and usurping, the rights and prerogatives of that Christ who, in the New Testament, is declared to be the one mediator between God and man (1 Tim. ii. 5), the alone Priest and High Priest (Heb. iv. 15; vii. 23—27), the one Sacrifice once offered (Heb. x. 12—14).

Such a sacrificing priest, of the Mass, is as opposed to the character of the president among us the true race of priests—to employ Justin's phraseology—as he is diverse from and opposed to the whole catalogue of Christian office-bearers named in the New Testament. They are apostles, prophets, teachers, workers of miracles, healers, helps, governments, speakers with tongues, interpreters (1 Cor. xii. 28, 29); or they are evangelists, pastors

[1] Sacerdos, of the Latin; ἱερεύς, of the Greek Liturgies.

(Eph. iv. 11), or bishops, presbyters, deacons, angels—all these designations are given in Scripture to officers in the Christian Church; but by the name of priest no Church officer is ever designated in the apostolic writings. That title, in figurative application, is bestowed, by Peter and by John the divine, upon all Christians equally, upon laity and clergy alike; but, in its exact and literal signification, it is reserved by the truly apostolic Church for Christ and Christ alone.

With respect to the repeated mention of the "altar" in the Mass, where the New Testament would dictate a mention of the Lord's Table, we shall only here remind the reader of what has been written in a former part of this essay, pp. 92—97.

4. "*Vestments*," *etc.*

After noticing these important contrasts between the Mass and the apostolic breaking of bread, we proceed to draw attention to the "sacred vestments," so called, that are to be assumed by the priest, or to the "silken cope" which a lesser ministrant is to put on before he chants the "Alleluia." Where is there a trace of such practices in Scripture? How markedly are they absent from the word-pictures of Justin Martyr! Yet, in the Mass-book, they stand not by themselves. Their æsthetic prettiness is matched by "candlesticks" to be used in daylight: by incense and censers and censing in abundance; by basins and towels and washings which are as vapid as those of the Jews, and even more uncomely because of their publicity.

We pass by the bowings oft: the kissing now of one object or person, now of another; the transitions from one position to another; the facing in different directions at

different moments; the reading the Epistle northwards and the Gospel southwards; the utterance at one breath of a long string of words; the keeping the thumbs and first fingers in particular positions; the rinsing and draining of the cup, and holding it up for any drops to fall into the priest's mouth—these minor matters we pass by with the mere remark, that the unsophisticated mind can hardly fail to observe the minute and effeminate character of these practices and prescriptions in contrast with the manly simplicity of the Eucharist as described by Justin, and, still more, as enjoined and portrayed by the Evangelists and by St. Paul.

5. *The Idea of "Merit."*

The next point to which we would draw attention is the manner in which the idea of "merit" is introduced into the Mass. It is true there are passages in the Mass of exceeding beauty, in which the idea of human frailty and sinfulness is most fitly recognized. In such passages, quite in accordance with the oldest usage, we meet with expressions such as these:

"O Lord Jesu, may the sacrament of Thy body and blood, *which though unworthy I receive*, be not to me for judgment and condemnation, but by Thy goodness may it be profitable for the salvation of my body and soul. Amen."

Or, again, "I pray that this sacrament of our salvation, *which I an unworthy sinner have received*, may not come to me for judgment and condemnation *on account of my deservings*," etc.

These words have the true ring of Christian piety in them. But there are others in the same Mass-book, coming doubtless from a different author and a more corrupt

age, whose spirit is as different from these as is their sound. For instance, at the close of the beautiful collect for the cleansing and inspiration of our hearts, we find, in the Mass, these words:

"So that we may *merit* to love Thee perfectly and praise Thee worthily. Through Christ."

Similarly, at the end of the commemoration of Mary and the apostles and martyrs, we meet with the words:—

"And to *their merits* and prayers do Thou grant that in all things we may be defended by the aid of Thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen."

And so, once more, in the prayer over the mixture of the bread and wine, one supplication is that it may be "a salutary preparation *for meriting* and receiving eternal life."

How different is all this idea of our merits, and of the merits of our fellow-beings, from the Christian principle that when we have done all the possibilities of our infinitely capable nature, we are still unprofitable servants who have only done that which was our duty! (Luke xvii. 10.)

And yet, again, how far short fall these phrases in the Mass of the pious truth, "Merit lives from man to man, and not from man, O Lord, to Thee." Such pleading of human merit before God is obviously in contravention of Scripture and natural piety, and even of the better portions of the Mass-book itself.

6. "*Ave Maria*," *etc.*

As to the "*Hail, Mary*" of the prefatory portion of the Mass: as to the declaration, in the collect following the "Offertory," that the offering is made "*in honor of blessed Mary* . . . for my sins and offences, and for the

salvation of the living and the repose of . . . the dead"; and, again, as to the pleaded "*intercession* of *blessed and glorious Mary, ever Virgin*, mother of God";—these appeals and prayers to the blessed mother of our Lord are in strange opposition to the teaching of Scripture, that while Jesus was loving and dutiful to His mother, in all things lawful, from the cradle to the cross, yet He failed not to remonstrate with her forgetfulness that His Father's work had highest claims upon Him even in boyhood; that the fitting hour for His wondrous works must be patiently awaited at Cana; and that they who heard and did His commands were nearer and more truly akin to Him than His mother after the flesh while she disbelieved his heavenly mission.

Such firm though loving opposition on the part of Jesus to His mother's erring ways is strangely out of keeping with the notion that that blessed woman's intercession in heaven availeth aught. Nor, if we bear in mind how completely Scripture represents Mary as misunderstanding her son and joining in the family cry that His zeal for God and man betokened Him as mad, do we find any ground for the belief that Mary's mind was so intelligently and entirely in harmony with the will of Heaven that her supplication must needs be in accordance with the purposes of God. True, we hope and trust that she has been numbered with all those spirits of the just made perfect who form part of the fellowship of the saints; but this is surely no ground for supposing that Mary has special merit, or any merit, wherewith to intercede for others before God.

No less contrary to Scripture, which speaks of the brothers of our Lord, and carries instruction in the assurance that Joseph knew not his wife "*till* she had

brought forth her first-born son," is the address to Mary as "ever virgin."

7. *Confession, in the Mass.*

As to the confession and absolution which are introduced into the Mass, we observe that they are only so far out of keeping with the teaching of Holy Writ as they prescribe confession to "blessed Mary, to all the saints, and to you," the congregation present from time to time, in addition to confession to God. Such confession, however, is not prescribed as a detailed enumeration of one's sins aloud. Neither is it, on the face of the Salisbury Mass-book, a prescribing of private confession to the priest. It may be, if confined to the letter of the Mass, an humbling of one's self before one's fellow-believers, not out of keeping with St. James's precept, Confess your faults one to another. It may be a prelude or an adjunct to some such examining of one's self as that enjoined by St. Paul. In either of these aspects of the matter, the confession of the Mass might be permissible enough. Church history does not fail, of course, to tell us how public confession of notorious sin was part of the severe discipline of comparatively early times. Nor does history leave us uninformed how this terrible and humiliating ordeal was afterwards made easier for penitents by the substitution of private confession to the priest.

These arduous and perilous practices, however, are not directly referred to in the Salisbury Missal. Its general acknowledgments of our sinfulness, with the true and beautiful words "through my own fault" (*meâ culpâ*), are only so far in opposition to the spirit of the New Testament as they harshly and forcibly drag in a mention of the Virgin Mary.

8. *Absolution, in the Mass.*

The form of absolution is not a little remarkable.

It is entirely different from that indicative form, "I absolve thee," which was never used before the twelfth or thirteenth century.[1] It is a prayer, a repeated prayer, for God's forgiveness of the penitent:—

"May Almighty God have mercy upon you and put away from you all your sins; may He deliver you from all evil; may He preserve and confirm you in goodness; and may He lead you to eternal life. Amen."

This is a series of supplications of beauty unsurpassable; and whencesoever Osmund, the compiler of the Sarum Missal, derived it, in the latter part of the eleventh century, its odor is of sanctity, of wisdom, and of apostolic Christianity.

The second prayer is as follows:—

"May the Almighty and Merciful God grant you absolution and remission of all your sins, opportunity for true penitence, amendment of life, and grace and comfort of the Holy Spirit. Amen."

Here, again, is only one exception that can be taken to the words. "Penitence" is but a poor rendering of the word *μετάνοια* (repentance) in the New Testament. These latter words, in the English and the Greek, denote a weighing again of the judgments of the mind, and a consequent entire change of judgment and of mind. They include, doubtless, more or less of pain ("penitence," penance) at the discovery of one's self in a wrong mind, with wrong judgments; but this element of pain, which is the chief if not the only ingredient in the Latin word penitence, is very far from being all, or the main part, in

[1] See Bingham's Antiquities, xix. 2. § 5.

that repentance, not to be repented of, which is the result of godly sorrow.

To this extent the second part of the absolution in the Mass falls short of the Scriptural ideal; but, otherwise, it is excellent—no mere empty declaration of that which is either useless if the penitent be already absolved in heaven, or untrue if he be no real penitent, but one void of sincere repentance.

The form of absolution in the Mass combines prayer for pardon with no slight instruction as to the way that leads to forgiveness; and this prayerful teaching of Christ as the way, the truth, and the life, for the putting off of sin, is the highest mode of absolution. Only in proportion as this absolution in the Mass treats of "penitence" instead of "repentance," and omits more definite and express reference to Christ as the Saviour, does it fall short of the perfect standard of Scriptural absolution; and, indeed, it ought in fairness to be said that, probably, the poverty of the Latin language in any other term adequately to express the μετάνοια of the Greek, or the "repentance" of our English, may be the cause of part of this faultiness in the Missal's form of absolution.

9. "*Holy of Holies*," *etc.*

Very different is the feeling with which we bring under notice the next point in the Mass-book. Before the giving of the kiss of peace, we find this prayer:—

"Take from us, O Lord, all our iniquities, that with pure minds we may merit to enter the holy of holies. Through Christ."

This expression, "holy of holies," is here evidently intended to designate that part of the church-building in which lies "the altar" of the Mass; and such an usage of

the phrase is thoroughly unscriptural and misleading. In Judaism, of course, the inmost shrine of the Temple was the "holy of holies"; but in apostolic Christianity that very expressive figure of speech is appropriated to something very different from any part of an earthly building, namely, to that higher world whither (Heb. ix. 12) Christ, by His own blood, entered in once, having obtained eternal redemption.

To designate the site of the Lord's Table in a Church as "the holy of holies," is thus obviously as unscriptural a misnomer as to call the Table an altar, or to speak of men's meriting God's grace as is here done.

The whole system must, in the light of Scripture, either stand or fall together. In the Mass-book one finds abundant mention of the "priest," the "altar," the "holy of holies," the "sacrifice," the "host," or victim slain (*hostia* of the Latin); but in Scripture not one of these terms, not one of the ideas they connote, is ever brought into connection with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The "priest," in apostolic thought, is either every believer offering spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise, or else it is Christ offering Himself once for all. The apostolic "altar" is the cross, outside Jerusalem, on which Jesus suffered. The "sacrifice," or victim slain, or "host" is none other than Christ crucified. The "holy of holies" is heaven, whither Christ ascended, and where He ever liveth to make intercession for us.

Such is the invariable use of these correlative terms in the New Testament; and their systematic employment, in other connections of thought and with quite different and, to a great extent, contradictory significations in the Mass-book, cannot fail, we submit, as an obvious matter of logical necessity, to mislead the minds of the unlearned

and the unwary by putting other persons and other things and other ideas into the place of those intended by apostolic teaching and example.

10. *The Sign of the Cross.*

We pass by the frequent employment of the sign of the cross, now singly used, now thrice repeated, and now again five times. This symbolic action is, assuredly, harmless enough in itself; but, so often reiterated, it becomes wearisome and vexatious, and is only too apt to degenerate into a series of empty and thoughtless formalities. No trace of such a practice is to be met with in the records of the apostolic Church.

11. "*Corporalia.*"

There is meaning, and it is unscriptural meaning, in naming the cloth for covering the bread and wine "corporalia" (cerements or body-clothes); for this name implies that when Christ said, This is My blood, He did not mean, as Scripture teaches, This cup is the new covenant in My blood, but He meant something quite different and inconsistent with that His explication of the words, namely, that the wine was changed objectively into His blood, and the bread into His body. So unscriptural and anti-scriptural is the whole phraseology and the whole underlying idea of the Mass, that it crops out even in such otherwise unimportant terms as this of "corporalia."

12. *The "Pax.*

In the handing round of the "Pax" we have another ceremony which is entirely unknown to the apostolic writers. It is said that the kiss of peace, such as was practiced in the time of Justin, gave rise to scandals, and that, therefore, it was abandoned, and the "Pax," a

material representation of Jesus, was handed round to be kissed by all the congregation, instead of the members kissing one another. Be that allegation true or not, here is an innovation—a somewhat distracting innovation—for which the earliest Christianity affords no warrant of precept or example.

13. *Bringing in the Elements.*

On the injunction that "after the introit of the Mass" certain officials shall bring in the bread and wine and water, and a basin of water and a towel, we are constrained to remark that such an action is calculated to disturb the solemnity and quiet of religious worship, and is completely unlike the taking part in a supper and in breaking of bread, such as that delineated in the writings of the apostles and Evangelists; and let it not be thought that such points—even minute points—of dissimilarity are unimportant. So far from being insignificant, the spirit and meaning of a rite is constituted by its details.

With simple and impressive but undistracting details, the intellectual and spiritual purport of the rite is one thing. With a ritual of complicated, gorgeous, and distracting details, the rite is quite different in its effect upon the human spirit. Hence the importance of observing the numerous and involved details of the Mass in contrast with the simplicity of the Eucharist as described in the New Testament.

14. "*In the Name of the Father*," *etc.*

From this notice of the bringing in of bread and wine and other things, not before the Lord's Supper, but in the midst of the service, after what the Mass-book calls the "introit," we pass on to notice a striking form of words

of frequent occurrence in the Mass. Over and over again the priest enunciates the words, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." These terms are probably an imitation of the very ancient practice of ending sermons with an ascription of glory to the Trinity. Used as they are, however, in the Mass-book (and in certain modern churches of the West at the beginning of sermons and in many other places), their aim seems to be, not so much to glorify the Godhead, as to assert, for the preacher or the priest, that he speaks and acts in place of the Trinity, and with all the authority of God Himself. That any single minister of religion should assume to himself such authority, or should use words capable of being fairly understood as if he arrogated to himself or to his office such authority, is, we confess, a phenomenon of surprising audacity.

Its frequent repetition in the Mass-book forms quite a characteristic feature in that service, and stands out in marked contrast with apostolic utterances against lording it over God's heritage (1 Peter v. 3), and against the iniquity of one who should so act or speak "that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. ii. 4).

Such audacity, not to use a stronger and perhaps a fitter word, is in very marked opposition to the letter and the spirit of the New Testament.

15. *Inconsistencies in the Mass.*

And next we come to notice certain words of prayer and of apostrophe, in the Mass, connected with the eucharistic elements. These expressions are sometimes hardly consistent one with another. They betoken, in a very interesting manner, the different ages, and the quite

opposite conditions of religious thought, out of which the Mass-book grew in its several parts.

From very early times, for instance, and from a frame of mind akin to that of the apostles, must have proceeded the supplication that Almighty God would so bless the oblation of bread and wine "that it may become *to us* the body and blood of" Christ. Notice the difference between praying that the elements may become the body and blood of Christ absolutely, objectively, and in themselves, on the one hand, and praying, on the other hand, that they may become so, relatively, subjectively, not in themselves but to and for us—that we, receiving the bread and wine, may also receive the spiritual benefits that accrue to man from the body of Christ slain and from His blood shed. Here is thought and piety very widely separated from transubstantiation or consubstantiation; and it is not easy to reconcile this prayer for the subjective presence of Christ at the Lord's Supper with the "Hail for ever, holiest flesh of Christ," or with the "Hail for ever, heavenly draught," of another part of the Mass.

It is very interesting and instructive to observe how prayers for the sacramental elements "becoming," relatively to the recipients, a blessing and a means for the reception of Christ and His salvation, abound in the Mass-book. This indicates an earlier origin for such parts of the Mass than the thirteenth century, when the Lateran Council made transubstantiation a doctrine to be believed by the Church.

Nay, those frequent and distinct marks of a belief in the sacramental presence of Christ being in and with the recipients, not in, with, or instead of the elements, betoken that Osmund himself, in drawing up the Salisbury Missal, grafted into it traditional thoughts that were

more ancient than Paschasius Radbertus, that probably came down in an unbroken stream from the apostles and from the Lord Himself. Very beautiful are these gleams of truth in the midst of mediæval darkness; but they become strange and ghastly when we find them in close contrast with the materializing of Christ's eucharistic presence—as, for instance, in the prayer, "May *this sacred mixture of the body and blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ *be made to me, and to all who receive it*, health of mind and body," etc.

Why, surely, if communion with the Lord be a matter of substantial and objective participation, and if the "mixture" be already absolutely and objectively the "body and blood" of Christ, no greater blessing could on that hypothesis by realized, prayed for, or imagined, than physical incorporation and identity with that already present Deity; and so this supplication would be vain. But the ancient spirit of Christendom breathes through the mediæval error, and supplicates that, over and above any material change believed to have come upon the bread and wine and to have made them "body and blood," there yet may be an effect, in the minds and hearts of all partakers, by means of which the realization of communion with Jesus, and of all the benefits thereof, may accrue to the recipients. And what is this but an acknowledgment, in the Mass-book itself, and that at the very moment of declaring the doctrine of material transubstantiation, that the highest and only effectual and salutary presence of Christ is "to the recipients," relatively to themselves, not in the mere material elements, however changed these may be supposed to be by consecration, but in the minds of partakers—that is, subjectively, not objectively?

So have we, in the Mass itself, not only the Scriptural idea of Christ's subjective presence; but the unscriptural notion of His material and objective presence is also taught by the same Mass, and sometimes, as in this collect we have just been considering, the two inconsistent and contradictory lines of thought fall into close neighborhood and conspicuous contrast.

16. *Words of Institution in the Mass.*

And now it will be necessary to look, for a few moments, at the words of institution as they are quoted and engrafted into the Sarum Missal.

Of the words connected with the bread, we will only observe that, in view of the mediæval and pre-Reformation practice of the priest generally communicating in the elements instead of the people, in view of the rare occasions on which the entire congregation partakes of the communion in unreformed Churches, it is very remarkable to find that the Salisbury Mass-book had added to the Saviour's form of institution, connected with the bread, the last three words of the injunction, "Eat of it, *all of you.*"

But let us now look at the words of institution of the wine as they are recited in the Missal:—

"Likewise, after supper, He took the glorious cup into His sacred and venerable hands: and, giving thanks to Thee, He blessed and gave to His disciples, saying, Take and drink of it, all of you: for this is the cup of My blood of the new and eternal covenant, the mystery of the faith, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. As oft as ye do these things, ye shall do them in memory of me."

There is no need to dwell at any length upon the epi

thet "glorious "attached to the cup, or upon the introduction of the word "hands," with the epithets "sacred and venerable" attached to them; but we cannot help making two remarks on this point.

First, a quotation, we submit, should be made with the least possible alteration of its original form. This holds good with the greater force the more solemn may be the occasion of the quoting; and it will be confessed on all sides that, whether regard be had to the position and nature of Him who originated the words of sacramental institution, or whether we regard the tremendous results of change in the bread and wine attributed to the repetition of the Lord's words over the eucharistic elements, this is an occasion demanding the most exact quotation.

But, further, we must observe that, in our best judgment of what is comely and dignified, the contrast between "Likewise, after supper, He took the cup," and the more ornate terms imported into the Mass-book—this contrast is like that between the lily as it comes from the hand of God, and the same lily when men has painted over its loveliness.

The next point to be noticed in the words of institution is the introduction of the term "disciples" as the designation of those to whom our Lord gave the cup. This we hold to be unquestionably the correct noun for the filling up of the quotation in this place; but this fair and Scriptural mention of the disciples, as *disciples* and not as apostles, is not a little striking and instructive when we remember that, in the later usage of the Mass-book, the laity were deprived of all participation in the sacramental wine; and one chief argument, in defence of such withholding of the cup, is that Christ gave it to His *apostles* as such, and not in their character of *disciples*.

In the same line of logical thought does the due quotation of Christ's words, "Drink of it, *all of you*," occur to us. Obviously, these words of sacred institution and command could not be expunged or obliterated even after the late mediæval custom had been established of keeping one-half of the Eucharist from the laity in utter and diametrical contravention of the sacred precept, Drink of it. *all of you.* When the priest was left, in the majority of Masses, to partake of the bread by himself or with a mere handful of people from among the spectators, it might be alleged in his defence that he was ready to administer to all, but that the congregation was slow and negligent, and therefore did not partake; but here, in dealing with the cup, the priest was bound to rehearse the Saviour's command, Drink of it, all of you, and yet he would on no account permit the laity—that is, the vast majority of the congregation—to comply with their Lord's freshly recited injunction. Such defiance of apostolic writings and of the divine maxim would seem inconceivable if it were not plain and notorious.

Inaccuracy and the foisting in of strange matter, other than that which Christ appointed, mark the continuation of what should be our Saviour's words of institution.

In none of the four histories of the institution are the words, "This is the cup of My blood," to be found. Nor do those histories qualify the new covenant, in this connection of thought, with the harmless epithet "eternal." Neither do they represent Jesus as calling the cup or any part of the Eucharist "the mystery of the faith." Nor do those histories put any such future tense into the Lord's mouth as that which is here incorrectly quoted by the Mass to the effect that Christ's blood "*shall* be shed." Accuracy of quotation, in the method here adopted of

blending all the four records of the institution, would have required the words to stand thus: This cup is My blood, that is, It is the new covenant in My blood: but then this accurate blending of the Scriptural narratives would have been fatal to the doctrine of transubstantiation and of any objective presence of Christ in the cup. It would have defined and limited the sense in which the cup could be called the blood of Christ as only signifying or symbolizing the new covenant ratified by Christ's blood. The introduction of the word "eternal" is harmless enough, except in so far as it is a painting of the rose.

Still worse, in point of taste, and more characteristically unscriptural, is the Mass-book's dragging in here of the words, "the mystery of the faith," as if Christ had spoken them.

However many things Jesus or the writers of the New Testament may have designated as mysteries or things once secret and unknown, but now revealed and made quite clear to every believer, there is no trace or indication that they ever once applied the name "mystery" to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and therefore, in whatever sense, true and wise or false and foolish, the terms "mystery of the faith" are here introduced, they are surreptitious. They are, contrary to all Scripture usage, represented as applied by Christ to this part of the Eucharist.

The object of the futurity which is attributed to the shedding of Christ's blood, as if He had said, My blood which *shall be shed*, instead of pointedly saying, My blood which *is being* shed—the purpose of this deliberate substitution of the Mass's future for Christ's present is, we fear, too obviously, to sustain, in the minds of the heedless or the ignorant, the unscriptural idea that Christ's

blood, instead of being shed once for all upon the cross, was often to be poured out in the service of the Mass.

Let it be borne in mind that this recitation of the words of institution is just that which the maintainers of the Mass depend upon as constituting the consecration of the bread and wine. These words of institution, it is, which, on their showing, change the bread and wine into different substances, and make them flesh and blood—these words of Jesus are relied upon as bringing the Lord's objective presence into the bread and wine; and yet observe how these most important words are tampered with, and changed and added to. What we have here is indeed a marvellous reliance upon the words of Christ to work a miracle, while yet those words are not quoted in their integrity, but there is a stupendous and audacious altering and corrupting of them.

17. *Sacrifice for the Dead.*

What a flood of light is thrown upon the mediæval and unreformed use of the Mass as a sacrifice for the dead by the words, "Let him rest in peace," which are prescribed as the termination of the Mass when it is said on behalf of the dead! For this practice there is, of course, no shade or vestige of Scripture warrant. The practice is utterly opposed to apostolic teaching: and whether we think of the abuses which have degraded the Church by reason of this unscriptural practice, or whether we think of the inhuman cruelty of any priest who, having in the Mass a power to lessen and expedite the supposed horrors of a soul in purgatory, should wait to use that power until the widow or the orphan had paid him money for the Mass, the idea is as terrible in its heartlessness as it is monstrous in its unreasonableness, and wholly without the semblance of any support from Holy Writ.

18. *The "Amen."*

Before closing these comments on the Missal of Sarum, there are two or three further points of contrast to which attention should be drawn as distinguishing the Mass of the sixteenth century from the Lord's Supper in the time of Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century.

We noticed, in examining Justin's description of the sacred rite, with what insistency it was urged that the people—all the people—took part with their president in every portion of the service. The people's "Amen," "the Amen," was a marked feature in the celebration. "The people," says Justin, "assent to his good words with their Amen." So far from this being the invariable practice in the Salisbury Mass-book, several solitary supplications are prescribed, and there is at least one repetition of the Lord's Prayer, that shortly before the breaking of the bread, in which the priest is to say the "Amen" "by himself."[1]

No reason can be assigned for thus precluding the people from a privilege and a duty prescribed alike by piety, by reason, and by the practice of primitive and apostolic times, except the mediæval desire to make the distinction more and more marked between the officiating priest and the people or participating priests. This characteristic of the Mass is curious, unscriptural, and anti-apostolical in itself, but we notice it the rather for a reason that will soon become apparent when we enter upon the investigations of our next book.

19. *The "Sermon."*

In Justin's description we noticed that, after reading from "the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of

[1] Privatim.

the prophets," "the president admonishes and exhorts us to imitate their good example"; in other words, there was a practical discourse, or sermon, made in the midst of the Liturgy, after the reading of the Lessons or the Epistle and Gospel. Here was an appeal to the reason and judgment of the congregation, and a pious attempt to work upon their will and self-determination through the mind and heart.

The sermon was thus, in primitive times, a very important part of the eucharistic service; but when we come to the Mass-book of Salisbury, among all its copious and abundant rubrics, telling where candles shall be put, how fingers shall be wiped and how they and thumbs shall be held together or apart—amidst a vast complication of such minute injunctions, there is no mention made of any appeal to the heart and conscience of the people by the sympathetic intelligence of him who acts as leader and president in the service. In other words, while the body is regulated in its every movement, the higher parts of man are left unheeded and uncared for. It is indeed a contrast and a falling off that has in this respect crept in between the time of Paul or of Justin, and the days of mediæval ignorance.

20. *Participation or Communion.*

In Justin's description of the Lord's Supper it was noticeable how the deacons distributed the bread and wine to all who were present, and how, even to absent members of the Church, they conveyed portions of the eucharistic elements.

What a change had come over this practice when, in the days of Chrysostom, the people dispersed occasionally, after listening to his eloquence, without partaking

of the Eucharist; when, in later times, certain councils made communion obligatory upon the laity only three times in the year, at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide; and when, in the thirteenth century, the fourth Lateran Council made such communion, with auricular confession, obligatory no more than once a year, at Easter! So it came to pass that, instead of every member of the Christian Church communicating in both the sacramental elements at least once a week, the vast majority of the congregation were, by the sixteenth century and long before that time, forbidden to participate in the cup at all; and for their hardly more than annual participation in the other element of bread, not a single rubric is to be found in the Mass-book of Sarum.

When, thus, the practice of communion and fellowship in the sacred feast was forbidden, maimed, curtailed, and by implication discouraged, it could hardly be matter of astonishment that the Mass-book well-nigh ignored all mention of "communion," all reference to charitable help for fellow-Christians, and all reminders among communicants—after their communion or away from the place of celebration—that Christian life should be so pure and energetic and self-denying as to be worthy of that high and holy communion with God and Christ and all the saints.

Just as, in spite of the general tone of the Mass-book implying that the whole congregation are to join in the prayers and thanksgivings, yet the people had been taught to leave all or almost all to the priest long before the sixteenth century, so the ancient apostolic idea of communion and fellowship had well-nigh disappeared from the Missal. Its traces were still to be found, indeed, in one or two references to "communion" and "post-commun-

ion." Otherwise, Mass was most frequently not a communion at all, but only a solitary and private celebration.

21. *Utter Change, in the Mass.*

The Supper of the Lord, with its joyful communion in prayer and praise and breaking of bread, as instituted by Christ and practised by the apostles and depicted by Justin Martyr, had vanished and passed away; and the thing being changed and gone, language, without perhaps the conscious intention of those who used it, bore its emphatic and honest testimony to the change by substituting for the sacred and significant titles applied to the Communion in primitive times the slight and insignificant name of the Missa, the Dismissal, the Mass.

K. *The Plan of this Essay excludes an Historical Analysis, in detail, of Extant Ancient Liturgies.*

This representation of the contrast between the Communion of apostolic times and the Mass of the middle and dark ages, might be traced in its growth and development if the plan of this essay permitted or required us to examine the extant Liturgies of the Greek Church, or of the so-called apostolical constitutions; and similar results would accrue to us from an investigation of the ancient sacramentaries of Leo, or Gelasius, or Gregory the Great.

Our object, however, has not been to weary the reader with too many details of history or antiquity, but rather to set before him a distinct picture of the communion of the Lord's Supper in its first institution, in its apostolic simplicity, in its primitive usage. Then we tried to indicate some of the sources whence arose a departure from the Scriptural and primitive practices and doctrines;

and, lastly, it has been our endeavor to lay before the reader the actual Mass service of the pre-Reformation period, in order that its points of contrast might be distinctly recognizable in comparison with the memorial breaking of bread enjoined by the Lord as a communion with Himself and with all the members of His body the Church.

L. *Conclusion—the Contrast.*

A more striking contrast—a wider and more substantial difference than that between the Missal in its unknown Latin tongue and the apostolic Communion in words that were intelligible; between the non-sacerdotal presidents of the Communion and the sacrificing priests of the Mass; between the ordinary and unnoticeable costumes of the Communion and the gorgeous chasubles of the mediæval service; between the memorial feast of the apostles and the propitiatory sacrifice of the dark ages; between the humility and self-depreciation of the original breakers of bread and the merits spoken of in the Mass; between the Lord's Table of St. Paul and the high altar of sacerdotalism; between the Scriptural representation of Mary's errors, weakness, and dependence upon Jesus and upon John, and her meritorious intercession as inculcated in the Missal; between the utter absence of utensils and paraphernalia in the Scriptural Communion and the manifold array of candles and candle-bearers, incense and incense-bearers, choirs and holy of holies, basins and towels, corporals and sacrifices and hosts, hand-washings and cup-drainings, "Pax" representations and signs of the cross, introits and graduals and antiphons and sequences in the Mass; between the apostolic appeal to man's conscience and his judgment and the mediæval dictation, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son,

and of the Holy Ghost"; between the Lord's command, "Drink of it, all of you," and the withholding of the cup in the Romish service; between the frequent celebration without auricular confession in apostolic times, and the merely annual celebration with private confession to the priest in the Middle Ages; between all the people being priests according to John and Peter and Justin, and only some of the ministering officials being priests according to the Mass; between the sermon as an important feature of the primitive Communion, and the absence of a sermon in the Use of Sarum; between the whole congregation responding to the president and sounding forth its Amen in antiquity, and the marked discouragement given to the people's occasional Amen in the Mass; between the bread and wine being the body and blood of Christ only inasmuch as they were a communion of the new covenant ratified in the giving of His body and the shedding of His blood, as Scripture teaches, and the bread and wine being verily transmuted into the material or objective body and blood of Him who was born of Mary and pierced with a spear on the cross, as is taught by mediævalism;—a more striking contrast than is presented by this far from exhaustive catalogue of the differences between Christ's Breaking of Bread on the one hand, and the mediæval service of the Mass on the other hand, we submit it would be difficult to imagine: and so we leave the matter in order to see how this difference was dealt with in England three centuries ago and in succeeding times.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

BV 825 .M23 1881

MacNaught, John, 1826-189Ø.

Coena Domini

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00041102

S0-BYL-714